

The JOURNAL of

SOUTHERN HISTORY

VOL. XI

MAY, 1945

No. 2



Published quarterly by the
SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME XI

MAY, 1945

NUMBER 2

Published Quarterly by
THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION



BOARD OF EDITORS

FLETCHER M. GREEN
University of North Carolina

WESLEY F. CRAVEN
New York University

RUDOLPH L. BIESELE
University of Texas

THOMAS D. CLARK
University of Kentucky

BELL I. WILEY
University of Mississippi

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON
Louisiana State University

BERNARD MAYO
University of Virginia

KATHRYN ABBEY HANNA
Rollins College

MANAGING EDITOR

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY, Vanderbilt University

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATE

NORA C. CHAFFIN, Vanderbilt University

GUARANTOR

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY



Correspondence in regard to contributions to the *Journal* should be sent to the Managing Editor, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.

The Southern Historical Association supplies the *Journal* to its members. The annual membership fee is three dollars; upon payment of fifty dollars, any person may become a life member. Single numbers of the *Journal* are available at seventy-five cents. Membership applications and checks should be sent to James W. Patton, Secretary-Treasurer, North Carolina State College, Raleigh, North Carolina.

The Southern Historical Association disclaims responsibility for statements made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter April 5, 1935, at the Post Office at University Station, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Additional entry at Nashville, Tennessee.

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME XI

MAY, 1945

NUMBER 2



Copyright, 1945, by the Southern Historical Association

CONTENTS

<i>The Pattern of Migration and Settlement on the Southern Frontier.</i> By Frank L. Owsley	147
<i>Ante-Bellum Attempts of Northern Business Interests to "Redeem" the Upper South.</i> By George Winston Smith	177
<i>Incidents of the Confederate Blockade.</i> By Kathryn Abbey Hanna	214
<i>The Underwood Presidential Movement of 1912.</i> By Arthur S. Link	230
 <i>Notes and Documents</i>	
A Letter of Marque Issued by William Augustus Bowles as Director General of the State of Muskogee. Edited by Duvon C. Corbitt and John Tate Lanning	246
 <i>Book Reviews</i>	
Krout and Fox, <i>The Completion of Independence, 1790-1830</i> , by Charles S. Sydnor	262
Bailey, <i>Thomas Cresap: Maryland Frontiersman</i> , by William D. Hoyt, Jr.	264
Pickard and Buley, <i>The Midwest Pioneer: His Ills, Cures, and Doctors</i> , by F. Garvin Davenport	265
Martin, <i>Florida During the Territorial Days</i> , by Robert S. Cotterill	267
Ekirch, <i>The Idea of Progress in America, 1815-1860</i> , by Chester McA. Destler	269
Godbolt, <i>The Church College in the Old South</i> , by Walter B. Posey	271
Patterson, <i>Journal of a Southern Student, 1846-48, with Letters of a Later Period</i> , by James W. Patton	273
Kane, <i>Deep Delta Country</i> , by Edwin Adams Davis	274
Haley, <i>Charles Schreiner, General Merchandise: The Story of a Country Store</i> , by H. C. Nixon	275
Daniels, <i>The Wilson Era: Years of Peace, 1910-1917</i> , by George C. Osborn	276
 <i>Historical News and Notices</i>	
Personal	278
Historical Societies	280
Bibliographical	282
Contributors	294

The Pattern of Migration and Settlement on the Southern Frontier

BY FRANK L. OWSLEY

The motives for migrating from the old, well-established communities of the United States into the fresh lands of the state and federal public domains varied with many individuals. A debtor might flee into the wilderness and divest himself of his debts as a cow rids herself of the swarms of tormenting insects by dashing through a thicket of bushes; the lawbreaker might thus get beyond the reach of the sheriff; the complexities of family and marital relations could be permanently simplified without wasting money on a lawyer and alimony by a move of a hundred miles in a well-chosen direction; old vices and old cronies could be left behind by the morally bankrupt who wished to begin life anew; tragedy might be put out of mind in a country so new and exciting. Thus sanctuary for all those desiring escape seemed to lie out beyond the fringe of settlement. Indeed, going from the old communities into the new country was, to many a migrant, like passing through a doorway, which closed behind him and through which he returned no more.

Others moved to the new country, not to seek escape but to be with their families and friends who were moving into the promised land. Love of adventure was often a powerful inducement to migrate. But the motive common to most immigrants was the desire to acquire the ownership or the free use of some portion of the public domain.

If one considers the landed resources that were available to the American people in the period between the Revolution and the Civil War, it would appear that the average American farmer, North and

South, had ample opportunity of becoming a landowner; for a total of 1,309,591,680 acres had been federal lands during this time.¹ But there were also large bodies of state land on which immigrants might settle during the ante-bellum period. Much of the 22,400,000 acres that comprised the province of Maine was public land at the beginning of the period.² Perhaps 90 per cent of the 37,929,600 acres in Georgia was unsettled at the end of the Revolution.³ Pennsylvania, New York, western Virginia, and western North and South Carolina contained large areas of lands yet to be disposed of by those states. Kentucky's 24,115,200 acres and Tennessee's 29,184,000 acres were just being pioneered at the close of the Revolution.⁴ In 1845, Texas, having retained ownership of its public lands, possessed an imperial domain of 175,587,840 acres, about 100,000,000 acres of which were arable.⁵

The existence of these vast unsettled areas of public lands was an irresistible invitation to the land hungry to come and help themselves. And help themselves they did: speculators, land thieves, modest blackmailers who took only what the traffic would bear, squatters who wished to graze their hogs and cattle and to hunt, squatters who were carving out farmsteads and plantations, swarmed into what seemed a boundless empire.

During the interval between the Revolution and the Civil War the combined federal and state public domains in the South were greater than those in the North, while the population of the South was far less. In 1848, before the creation of Oregon as a territory, the area of the organized states and territories of the South was more than twice as

¹ Benjamin H. Hibbard, *A History of the Public Land Policies* (New York, 1924), 78; Thomas C. Donaldson, *The Public Domain; Its History, with Statistics* (Washington, 1884), table on p. 13.

² Roy M. Robbins, *Our Landed Heritage; The Public Domain, 1776-1936* (Princeton, 1942), 9.

³ Samuel G. McLendon, *History of the Public Domain of Georgia* (Atlanta, 1924), *passim*.

⁴ Robbins, *Our Landed Heritage*, 9, 26-27; Donaldson, *Public Domain*, 202; Hibbard, *Public Land Policies*, 78.

⁵ *De Bow's Review* (New Orleans, 1846-1880), XIII (1852), 53. See Aldon S. Lang, *Financial History of the Public Lands in Texas* (Waco, 1932), and Reuben McKittrick, *The Public Land System of Texas, 1823-1910* (Madison, 1918), for detailed treatment of the landed resources of Texas.

great as that of the North, while the white population of the South was less than half of that of the North.⁶ But the southern agricultural immigrants had another great advantage over the northern settlers, in that the grain and livestock farmers of the Upper South and the southern highlands could move into the public domain of the Northwest, while the northern farmers could not profitably move farther South.

With such great landed resources so cheap and available and such a relatively small population, it was inevitable that the majority of the agricultural population, and even those dependent upon a grazing economy, should become freeholders in the newer portions of the Old South. But the continued emigration of vast numbers from the older southern states caused a sharp decline in land values in those areas, so that those who were unable or unwilling to emigrate could purchase farms and plantations in their own community almost at frontier prices.⁷

In the settlement of the public domains of the South, there were usually two distinct waves of settlers rather than the three generally ascribed to the northern frontier. The first wave consisted of herdsmen, who subsisted primarily upon a grazing and hunting economy; and in the second wave were the agricultural immigrants, coming to possess the land. Though many families of the second wave moved regularly from one frontier to another in one generation, it seems to be true that the desire of most was to find a place for permanent settlement.

The herdsmen, who were the typical southern pioneers, resembled in many respects the pioneer settlers of the Northwest, whom John M. Peck described in his *A New Guide for Emigrants to the West*. "First," observes Peck, "comes the pioneer, who depends for the subsistence of his family chiefly upon the natural growth of vegetation, called the 'range,' and the proceeds of hunting. His implements of agriculture are rude, chiefly of his own make, and his efforts directed mainly to a

⁶ See Donaldson, *Public Domain*, 28-29, for areas of states and territories.

⁷ Avery O. Craven, *Soil Exhaustion as a Factor in the Agricultural History of Virginia and Maryland, 1606-1860* (Urbana, 1926), 118, 120, 122-25; Avery O. Craven, *Edmund Ruffin, Southerner; A Study in Secession* (New York, 1932), 52, 53, 63; Luther P. Jackson, *Free Negro Labor and Property Holding in Virginia, 1830-1860* (New York, 1942), 35, 36.

crop of corn and a 'truck patch.' The last is a rude garden for growing cabbage, beans, corn for roasting ears, cucumbers and potatoes. A log cabin, and, occasionally, a stable and corn crib, and a field of a dozen acres, the timber girdled or 'deadened' and fenced, are enough for his occupancy."⁸ He occupies this place "till the range is somewhat subdued, and hunting a little precarious," and too many settlers come in; then he moves on to other frontiers.⁹ But the pioneer whom Peck thus describes was usually a subsistence farmer and hunter, while the southern pioneer as a rule was a livestock grazier and hunter who cultivated small truck gardens and corn patches for subsistence.

That the southern pioneer should be a herdsman in a land which has not been noted for its livestock and the northern pioneer should not be a grazier in a country of fine pasture lands, may seem odd. The explanation, however, is simple. The southern pioneers were much nearer the markets than were the northern settlers west of the mountains; but, of more importance, cattle and swine could be grazed in the South without having to be fed and sheltered during the winter, whereas in the Northwest the cold weather necessitated both feeding and housing of livestock. Livestock feeding, in contrast to grazing, of course, is the occupation of a well-settled farming community that has fair access to market. It must be observed, however, that the frontier ranges in the South were all that man and beast could desire as long as they were not overgrazed. The trees were loaded with nuts and mast for the swine, and the savannas and open forests, which had been kept clear of underbrush by the annual burnings by the Indians, billowed with wild oats and grasses, vetch, and peavines "tall enough to reach the shoulder of a man on horseback"; and the swamps and valleys were covered with dense canebrakes that furnished winter pasturage and protection from the cold.¹⁰

⁸ John M. Peck, *A New Guide for Emigrants to the West* (Boston, 1837), 119-20.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 120.

¹⁰ Sallie W. Stockard, *The History of Guilford County, North Carolina* (Knoxville, 1902), 55-56; Hope S. Chamberlain, *History of Wake County, North Carolina* (Raleigh, 1922), 69; Victor Davidson, *History of Wilkinson County [Georgia]* (Macon, 1930), 107-108; William P. Fleming, *Crisp County, Georgia, Historical Sketches* (Cordele, Ga., 1932), 24-25; Jethro Rumble, *A History of Rowan County, North Carolina* (Salisbury,

The best pasture lands were always those most suited for agriculture, and the herdsmen in quest of fine pastures naturally drove their herds into those parts of the public domain which the immigrant farmers would soon occupy. The result was that all the way from the Atlantic coast to the arid regions of the Southwest and from colonial times till after the Civil War, these pastoral folk were continuously crowded from the arable lands by the agricultural folk.

Livestock grazing was a major occupation in the South as long as there were large bodies of public lands. In colonial times many fortunes were made from herding livestock upon the wild lands of the proprietors or the king. Men owned herds ranging from a few dozen into the thousands of head.¹¹ Alexander Gregg says that in South Carolina "the number owned by a single individual were very large, almost incredibly so."¹² A British official in the late colonial period has left a vivid picture of cattle grazing in South Carolina and Georgia. He observed great droves of cattle "under the auspices of cowpen keepers, which move (like unto the ancient patriarch or the modern Bedowin in Arabia) from forest to forest in a measure as the grass wears out or the planters approach them."¹³

In the first thirty-odd years of the nineteenth century, as the herdsmen were forced by the agricultural settlers—who cleared and fenced the land and brought along their own smaller herds—to drive their livestock farther westward into the rich prairie and canebrake lands of

1881), 28-29, 54; A. J. Brown, *History of Newton County, Mississippi, from 1834 to 1894* (Jackson, 1894), 40-44; George G. Smith, *The Life and Letters of James Osgood Andrew, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church South* (Nashville, 1883), 23; George E. Brewer, *History of Coosa County, Alabama* (MS. in Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery), 48, 49.

¹¹ Joseph Schafer, *The Social History of American Agriculture* (New York, 1936), 93, 94, 95, 96; Lewis C. Gray; *History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860*, 2 vols. (Washington, 1933), I, 148-51, 200-212; Bartholomew R. Carroll (ed.), *Historical Collections of South Carolina*, 2 vols. (New York, 1836), II, 129; Alexander Gregg, *History of the Old Cheraws* (Columbia, 1905), 109, 110; William A. Schaper, *Sectionalism and Representation in South Carolina*, in *American Historical Association, Annual Report*, 1900, I (Washington, 1901), 295, 318-19.

¹² Gregg, *History of the Old Cheraws*, 109.

¹³ Quoted in Schaper, *Sectionalism in South Carolina*, 295, and Gray, *History of Agriculture in the Southern United States*, I, 148.

Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, both the size and the profits of the business increased. Contemporary travelers and writers were always impressed with the great herds of cattle and swine that they observed feeding upon the luxuriant pasture lands of the public domain. Estwick Evans in traveling through the South during the year 1818 saw thousands of cattle feeding along the banks of the Mississippi in the state of Mississippi;¹⁴ Thomas Nuttall at about the same time noted huge droves of livestock on the prairies of southwestern Louisiana and in the Red River district of Arkansas.¹⁵ William Darby, who dwelt in the Southwest for some time and traveled extensively throughout the region in the preparation of his *Emigrant's Guide to the Western and Southern States*, also took note of the large droves of cattle along the lower Mississippi and in the western portions of Louisiana.¹⁶ Tilly Buttrick during the same period saw the cattlemen of Kentucky pasturing their herds north of the Ohio,¹⁷ and Fortescue Cuming, on a journey into Arkansas, found the Kentuckians grazing the lush pastures of the public domain in that territory.¹⁸ As late as 1837 John M. Peck remarked that "much of the forest lands, in the Western [Mississippi] Valley produces a fine range for domestic animals and swine. Thousands are raised, and the emigrant, grows wealthy, from the bounties of nature, with but little labor."¹⁹ In northern Florida cattle grazing was the chief occupation until late in the ante-bellum period. One observer wrote in 1850: "So numerous were the herds of cattle in Alachua . . . that from 7000 to 10,000 could be seen grazing at once on Payne's Prairie; and there was a single grazier on the Wacasassa whose stock had increased

¹⁴ Estwick Evans, *A Pedestrious Tour*, in Reuben G. Thwaites (ed.), *Early Western Travels, 1748-1846*, 32 vols. (Cleveland, 1904-1907), VIII, 303.

¹⁵ Thomas Nuttall, *Journal of Travels into the Arkansa Territory*, in Thwaites (ed.), *Early Western Travels*, XIII, 311.

¹⁶ William Darby, *The Emigrant's Guide to the Western and Southwestern States and Territories* (New York, 1818), 76-77.

¹⁷ Tilly Buttrick, *Voyages, Travels, and Discoveries, 1812-1819*, in Thwaites (ed.), *Early Western Travels*, VIII, 78.

¹⁸ Fortescue Cuming, *Sketches of a Tour to the Western Country (1807-1809)*, in Thwaites (ed.), *Early Western Travels*, IV, 298.

¹⁹ Peck, *New Guide for Emigrants*, 41.

in the course of a few years to the number of 3000 without any other expense than that of herding them."²⁰

The grazing of livestock on the agricultural lands and the lives of the herdsmen followed a regular pattern from colonial days to the Civil War. When a cattleman became wealthy he settled down in some well-selected spot, usually as a planter, and placed his livestock in charge of cowboys, who pastured them out past the fringe of settlement, along with the herds of the smaller owners living upon the frontier. William Darby describes in his *Guide*, this planter-cattleman combination in southern and western Louisiana, where the planters lived in the Teche country on their plantations, and employed cowboys, for one-fifth of the increase of the herd, to graze their livestock on the prairies far to the West. Many such cowboys acquired wealth, after which they in turn settled as planters and hired other cowboys to tend their herds out on the frontier. Frequently, too, the smaller herdsmen settled as farmers on land which they had purchased, and allowed their livestock to graze, along with those of neighboring farmers, on the unfenced farm and government lands of the community.²¹

By 1840 the better agricultural lands in the older states and in many parts of the newer ones had been sufficiently settled by farmers to interfere with grazing upon the open range, and the herdsmen had largely disappeared from such lands. Those who had not desired to settle as planters and farmers,²² but preferred their occupation and the frontier

²⁰ Quoted in Gray, *History of Agriculture in the Southern United States*, II, 834. Chapter XXXV of this work gives a sketch of the cattle business in the South for the post-revolutionary and ante-bellum period. See also, Brown, *History of Newton County*, 54, 55, 56; Simon P. Richardson, *The Lights and Shadows of Itinerant Life: An Autobiography* (Nashville, 1901), 86; Timothy H. Ball, *A Glance into the Great South-East; or Clarke County, Alabama, and Its Surroundings from 1540 to 1877* (Grove Hill, Ala., 1882), *passim*; Timothy Flint, *Recollections of the Last Ten Years* (Boston, 1826), 265.

²¹ Darby, *Emigrant's Guide*, 76-77. Cf. Schafer, *Social History of American Agriculture*, 93-97.

²² But it was no simple matter to change from a grazing economy to agriculture. Paul M. J. Vidal de La Blache, *Principles of Human Geography* (edited by Emmanuel de Martonne, translated from the French by Millicent T. Bingham, New York, 1926), 124, note 15, quotes a letter from M. Woeikof in support of the difficulty of changing from a grazing to an agricultural economy: "As far as I know the change from nomad [livestock grazing] to farmer does not occur except under the influence and in imitation of agricul-

with its plentiful game, fresh cattle ranges, and scarcity of neighbors, took up their abode in the pine forests and in the mountains where occasional graziers had already settled. Here, protected by the sterile, sandy soils of the piney woods and the rugged surface of the highlands, the herdsmen and hunters found sanctuary from the pursuing agricultural settlers. Thus it was agriculture rather than slavery that pressed these settlers into the less fertile and more rugged lands. This was an old phenomenon. From ancient times an agricultural economy has driven the livestock grazier into the deserts and the mountains, except in those states where the herdsmen control the government.²³

The ante-bellum inhabitants of the pine belt and, to a lesser extent, of the mountains have been classified rather broadly as poor whites. While groups of the same type of people could be found scattered here and there in the rough, timbered areas that constituted numerous islands in the midst of the richer lands, the dwellers in the highlands and in the piney woods appeared to those who lived outside these regions to constitute the two chief bodies of poor whites. They lived in log cabins or hewn log houses. Their means of support visible to the usual traveler who made hasty detours through the edges of the great woods and mountains were meager indeed. There were usually a few acres of corn, patches of sweet potatoes, cabbage, collards, peas, beans, pumpkins, and turnips, and perhaps a few rows of cotton and tobacco in a "deadening" where blackened stumps of pitch pine or hardwood stood like a ghost forest. There would be a lean milk cow, two or three scrubby horses, a few razor-back hogs in a pole pen or roaming about the premises, and a pack of emaciated hounds. On the woodpile near-by would be a fine, bright bladed ax; and should the stranger peep into the cabin he would see homemade beds, tables, stools, and chairs, and the wall lined with pegs on which to hang things. Over the mantel and,

tural neighbors." See also, Norman S. B. Gras, *A History of Agriculture in Europe and America* (New York, 1925), 9-10.

²³ Vidal de La Blache, *Principles of Human Geography*, 54, note 9, and 130-31. Invaders like the nomadic Mongols and Huns into weak agricultural states have imposed their economic system upon the country. In a mountainous country like Greece and much of the Balkans, livestock grazing has been more important than agriculture and has been able to push the farmer out of many a small valley.

if there was more than one male member of the family, on the wall in racks made of horns or pronged branches cut from trees would be the shiny, long-barreled "rifle guns." If the visitor were to go up in the "loft" he would probably find hanging from pegs numerous steel traps waiting to be set or repaired. The men seemed shiftless; for they would sit almost motionless for hours like a lizard on a sunny log, whittling transparent shavings from a piece of pine or spruce and occasionally squirting a liberal quantity of tobacco "juice" into the eye of a pig or chicken that came too close. While the men were thus taking their ease, the women hoed the corn, cooked the dinner, or plied the loom, or even came out and took up the ax and cut wood with which to cook the dinner.²⁴

Of course the great error that contemporary travelers and later writers have committed concerning the mountain and piney wood folk of the ante-bellum South has been to consider them agriculturists. Had they lived upon the plains, their livestock economy would have been apparent; but because of the great forests their herds of cows and droves of hogs were seldom to be seen by anyone passing hurriedly through the country. Nor could the economic importance of their subsidiary occupation of hunting and trapping be realized except by one who tarried long and learned the way of these taciturn folk. Another error that has helped develop the idea that the backwoodsmen and mountaineers as a class were poor whites has been the failure to regard them, during the period under consideration, in their true character as frontiersmen. Much of the mountain and pine areas was, except for the absence of the Indians, frontier country as truly as was the outer or western frontier; indeed these regions might be called the inner frontier. Great portions of the mountain country and the pine belt from Georgia to Texas were public domain until after the Civil War, and were sparsely settled and bountifully stocked with game.

Local historians, biographers, genealogists, and writers of autobiography and reminiscences, particularly lawyers, preachers, small town

²⁴ Frederick L. Olmsted, *A Journey in the Seaboard Slave States, with Remarks on Their Economy* (New York, 1856), 348-51, gives a traditional picture of piney woods people. See also, *De Bow's Review*, XVIII (1855), 188-89.

newspaper editors, and doctors, who have lived in and near the pine belt and mountains, possessed fuller knowledge and understanding of the life and character of the folk in these regions than did the casual traveler from the outside. A brief examination of some of their accounts will be useful in giving a more authentic view of backwoods and mountain life.

In 1840 John F. H. Claiborne of Natchez traveled slowly and systematically through the piney woods east of the Pearl River in Mississippi as a newspaper reporter in the company of a group of politicians on a political speaking tour. Claiborne's reports go right to the heart of the frontier economy of these people. It was quite obvious to him on his leisurely journey that the real business of the piney wood folk was the grazing of cattle and hogs. The beauty and abundance of the range impressed him. Much of the country, he observed, "is covered exclusively with the long leaf pine; not broken, but rolling like the waves in the middle of the great ocean. The grass grows three feet high and hill and valley are studded all over with flowers of every hue. . . . Thousands of cattle are grazed here for market."²⁵ "The people are for the most part pastoral, their herds furnishing their chief revenue."²⁶ "These cattle are permitted to run in the range or forest, subsisting in summer on the luxuriant grass with which the teeming earth is clothed, and in winter on green rushes or reeds, a tender species of cane that grow in the brakes or thickets in every swamp, hollow and ravine."²⁷ The trade in cattle, observed Claiborne, "has enriched many people."²⁸ He was amazed at the ease with which fish, wild turkeys, and other edible game were procured, and the great variety of food supplied the table on the shortest notice.²⁹ Only one agricultural product seems to have connected these people in his mind with farming: the incredible quantities of sweet potatoes used at all meals and between meals. He recounted with

²⁵ John F. H. Claiborne, "A Trip through the Piney Woods," in *Mississippi Historical Society Publications* (Oxford-Jackson, 1898-1925), IX (1906), 514.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 515. Cf. *ibid.*, 523, 533.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 521. Cf. *ibid.*, 530.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 522. Cf. *ibid.*, 521.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 516, 522.

gusto one occasion on which his kindly hostess surpassed the usual hospitality in dispensing sweet potatoes. He ate sweet potatoes with wild turkey and various other meats, had a potato pie for dessert and roasted potatoes offered to him as a side dish, drank sweet potato coffee and sweet potato home brew, had his horse fed on sweet potatoes and sweet potato vines, and when he retired he slept on a mattress stuffed with sweet potato vines and dreamed that he was a sweet potato that someone was digging up.³⁰

William H. Sparks, the jurist, who dwelt in the Natchez district, appears to have ridden the judicial circuit as lawyer and judge in the region described by Claiborne, where he had an opportunity of becoming closely acquainted with the piney wood folk. Later, in writing his memoirs, he devoted considerable space to a description of these people. Those settlements east of the Pearl River, he said:

. . . were constituted of a different people [from the agricultural population farther west]: most of them were from the poorer districts of Georgia and the Carolinas. True to the instincts of the people from whom they were descended, they sought as nearly as possible just such a country as that from which they came, and were really refugees from a growing civilization consequent upon a denser population and its necessities. They were not agriculturists in a proper sense of the term; true, they cultivated in some degree the soil, but it was not the prime pursuit of these people, nor was the location sought for this purpose. They desired an open, poor, pine country, which forbade a numerous population.

Here they reared immense herds of cattle, which subsisted exclusively upon coarse grass and reeds which grew abundantly among the tall, long-leaved pine, and along the small creeks and branches numerous in this section. Through these almost interminable pine-forests the deer were abundant, and the cane-brakes full of bears. They combined the pursuits of hunting and stock-minding, and derived support and revenue almost exclusively from these.³¹

Sparks knew some of these people quite well and he records a significant interview with a man whose grandfather and grandmother had settled in the Mississippi backwoods—then the Indian country—a few years after the Revolutionary War. The grandfather, he told Sparks, migrated from Emanuel County, Georgia.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 532-33.

³¹ William H. Sparks, *The Memories of Fifty Years* (Philadelphia, 1870), 331.

He carried with him a small one-horse cart pulled by an old gray mare, one feather bed, an oven, a frying-pan, two pewter dishes, six pewter plates, as many spoons, a rifle gun, and three deer-hounds. He worried through the Creek Nation, extending then from the Oconee River [in Georgia] to the Tombigbee River [flowing through parts of eastern Mississippi and western Alabama].

After four months of arduous travel he found his way to Leaf River, and there built his cabin; and with my grandmother, and my father, who was born on the trip in the heart of the Creek Nation, commenced to make a fortune. He found on a small creek of beautiful water a little bay land, and made his little field for corn and pumpkins upon that spot, all around was poor, barren woods, but he said it was a good range for stock; but he had not an ox or cow on the face of the earth. The truth is it looked like Emanuel County. The turpentine smell, the moan of the wind through the pine-trees, and nobody within fifty miles of him, was too captivating a concatenation to be resisted, and he rested here.

About five years after he came, a man from Pearl River was driving some cattle by to Mobile, and gave my grandfather two cows to help drive his cattle. It was over one hundred miles, and you would have supposed it a dear bargain; but it turned out well, for the old man in about six weeks got back with six other head of cattle [he had obviously been engaged in a bit of cattle rustling]. From these he commenced to rear a stock which in time became large [which indeed, according to Sparks' account, developed into a sizeable fortune].³²

The great pine belt of Alabama was primarily a cattle country. F. L. Cherry, writing in 1883, described one portion of the pine belt of that state, extending up into Russell County near which he had lived for fifty years:

There is a section of country about a hundred square miles or more, between the Chewakla and the Uchee Creeks, which fifty years ago [1833] would not number more than a dozen families and they were mostly cow "boys". This section was known as "Piney Woods" of Russell County, and as compared with the country on the creeks, was considered very poor, and profitably available only as a stock range. . . . As the land was nearly all public domain, and a market near at hand, the stock business was receiving considerable attention, and moderate fortunes soon accumulated.³³

Cherry also said that piney woods people raised no corn the first few years, and "but little of anything else except stock which ran wild on

³² *Ibid.*, 332-33.

³³ F. L. Cherry, *The History of Opelika and Her Agricultural Tributary Territory* (MS. in Alabama Department of Archives and History), 160.

the public domain.³⁴ In 1855 the pine lands of Alabama were still regarded as an unbroken forest affording "a fine stock range," practically undisturbed by the plowman;³⁵ indeed until after the Civil War little change had occurred and cattle grazing still prevailed.³⁶

It is estimated that in the contiguous piney woods districts in northwestern Florida, southern Alabama, and southeastern Mississippi, there were 1,000,000 head of cattle in 1850.³⁷ This is probably too high, but there were certainly no less than 650,000 head of cattle in this area, and a proportionate number of sheep and swine.³⁸ The Alabama piney woods county of Covington may be taken as typical of this grazing region. With a population of 3,645 and with only 9,201 acres under cultivation in 1850, this county had 824 horses and mules, 10,617 head of cattle, 1,306 sheep, and 18,272 swine.³⁹

In Georgia, and wherever there was a considerable area of sandy, pine-clad country, the story was the same. Simon Peter Richardson, a Methodist circuit rider and presiding elder on practically every circuit and district in northern Florida and southern Georgia during the late ante-bellum period, has left his impressions of the piney woods folk. In 1843 he was given the Irwin circuit, composed almost exclusively of the piney woods of southern Georgia. Richardson in his autobiography describes the country and the people of this circuit:

[It] . . . reached from Mobly Bluff to the Okenefenokee swamp; a round of about two hundred and fifty miles, to be traveled in three weeks. The most of the people then lived by raising stock. . . . There were many good, kind families on the circuit. Everybody was hospitable in those days, whether he had much or little. I went round the circuit. The congregations were meager. All the church houses were small log cabins, and the seats were benches without backs. The people were nearly all dressed in homespun. . . . The whole country

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 163.

³⁵ "On the Forests and Timber of South Alabama," in *De Bow's Review*, XIX (1855), 611-13. Cf. Lewis Troost, "Mobile and Ohio Railroad," *ibid.*, III (1847), 322.

³⁶ Joseph Hodgson (ed.), *Alabama Manual and Statistical Register for 1869* (Montgomery, 1869), 18-19. Cf. *ibid.*, for 1868, pp. 148-49.

³⁷ Gray, *History of Agriculture in the Southern United States*, II, 834.

³⁸ See *Seventh Census of the United States: 1850* (Washington, 1853), Table XI, 407-409, 429-33, and 456-60, for livestock production by counties in Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, Table XI, 429-33.

was a vast plain of long leaf pine forest. Sometimes the settlements were ten miles apart; but other parts were thickly settled.⁴⁰

Richardson later occupied some of the richest charges in his conference, yet of the fifty charges he had held when he wrote his autobiography, he considered the Irwin circuit of the pine barrens one of the most satisfactory of them all.⁴¹

William P. Fleming, basing his account in part upon the testimony of surviving pioneers, gives a vivid picture of Crisp County, Georgia, and its grazing economy. The pine lands of Crisp, he said:

were by that very classification, adjudged not the best for farm purposes, and, besides, these lands were fearfully "cumbered" with primitive forests of immense pines. Their adaptation to pasturage purposes, however, was apparent. Much of these lands, especially low lands hereabouts, grew wild oats in profusion, and the more elevated lands were heavily carpeted with wire grass, succulent and desirable to a prospective cattleman. A few older people now living are familiar with the fact that droves of cattle and sheep, numbering thousands, might be hidden from sight in wild oats when only a short distance from some one searching for them.

Cattle, hog, and sheep raising, he continued, "was the principal business" until the sawmills cut the timber in the 1880's and 1890's.⁴²

The importance of herding livestock in the Georgia pine belt and the almost exclusive devotion of its inhabitants to this business is shown in the census reports. In 1850, for example, the Georgia pine barrens, comprising about one-fourth of the area of the state and having about one-tenth of the population, produced over 400,000 head of cattle, 85,000 sheep, 356,000 swine, and 36,000 horses and mules.⁴³ This was nearly half the cattle, and about one-sixth of the sheep, swine, horses, and mules of the state. The huge county of Ware, with only 3,888 people and 11,316 acres under cultivation, had, according to the 1850

⁴⁰ Richardson, *Lights and Shadows of Itinerant Life*, 26-27. See also, Smith, *Life and Letters of James O. Andrew*, 23.

⁴¹ Richardson, *Lights and Shadows of Itinerant Life*, 43.

⁴² Fleming, *Crisp County Historical Sketches*, 24-25. See also, Davidson, *History of Wilkinson County*, 107-108, for a similar description of the range in the piney woods of Georgia at an earlier time.

⁴³ Seventh Census, Table XI, 377-84, for livestock, and Table I, 364-65, for population.

census, 781 horses and mules, 919 sheep, 20,993 head of cattle, and 26,054 swine.

The mountains were better ranges than the pine belt, for the soil was often fertile. In fact, more cattle, swine, and sheep per capita were raised in the Appalachians, the Cumberland Plateau, and the Ozarks than in the bluegrass basins of Kentucky and Tennessee.⁴⁴ But because of the difficulty of the terrain, cattle and herdsmen were unable to utilize as great a territory as could be grazed in the pine belt. Those who were fortunate enough, however, to gain control of the entrance of a high valley with ranges practically encircling it, had a natural pasture into which they might turn their cattle without danger of their straying. In May, cattle, horses, and sheep were turned into the mountains and allowed to remain there until October. The owners would visit their herds once a week and salt them to keep them gentle and prevent them from straying too far. In the fall they would drive them to market, usually on the coast. Through Buncombe County alone, high in the mountains of western North Carolina, 150,000 hogs and thousands of cattle passed annually on their way to market.⁴⁵ Unlike the pine belt, however, there were many rich valleys in which grain farmers raised huge quantities of corn to sell to the cattlemen to fatten the livestock for market or to feed them on their way to market. There were numerous "stock stands" along the French Broad River which fed 90,000 to 100,000 hogs a month while en route to market. Frequently, there would be 2,000 in one drove to be fed.⁴⁶ While cattle were grazed in large numbers just as in the piney woods, hogs were more important than cattle, for the hardwood growth produced immense crops of chestnuts, acorns, walnuts, and hickory nuts, and in the rich narrow valleys excellent corn could be grown. Not only did the mountains of North Carolina contribute to this stream of porkers and cattle; but many also came from those of Kentucky and Tennessee. In 1849-1850 at least 81,000 head of swine were driven to the east coast

⁴⁴ Gray, *History of Agriculture in the Southern United States*, II, 876, 884.

⁴⁵ John P. Arthur, *Western North Carolina; A History* (Raleigh, 1914), 285.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 285-87.

from the mountains in the two latter states.⁴⁷ The Cumberland Plateau was covered with grass "where an immense pasturage is afforded to the cattle," observed the British traveler, George W. Featherstonhaugh, in 1834.⁴⁸ Even the oak barrens on the highland rim in Tennessee to the west of the plateau was devoted primarily to grazing cattle and hogs.⁴⁹

Frederick L. Olmsted has left what may be accepted as a very good generalized picture of mountain economy in the late ante-bellum period.

The hills generally afford an excellent range, and the mast is usually good, much being provided by the chestnut, as well as the oak, and smaller nut-bearing trees. The soil of the hills is a rich dark vegetable deposit, and they cultivate upon very steep slopes. It is said to wash and gully but little, being very absorptive. The valleys, and gaps across the mountain ranges, are closely settled, and all the feasible level ground that I saw in three weeks was fenced, and either under tillage or producing grass for hay. . . . Horses, mules, cattle and swine, are raised extensively, and sheep and goats in smaller numbers throughout the mountains, and afford almost the only articles of agricultural export.⁵⁰

Ashe and Buncombe counties of North Carolina, located high up in the Smoky Mountains, may be considered typical of the mountains. In 1850 Ashe had a population of 8,777 and had only 64,805 acres under cultivation. There were in the county 2,713 horses and mules, 14,675 head of cattle, 18,250 sheep, and 25,267 swine. Buncombe's population at this time was 13,425, and there were 75,360 acres under cultivation. The county had 3,708 horses and mules, 16,349 head of cattle, 14,000 sheep, and 28,608 swine.⁵¹

There are no adequate statistics for the livestock business prior to the census of 1840; but grazing as distinct from livestock feeding was of greater relative importance in the ante-bellum South than in any other part of the United States. Indeed, the South produced a larger number of mules, swine, and beef cattle in proportion to population than any section until 1860, when the sparsely settled Pacific states led

⁴⁷ "The Hog Business in the West," in *De Bow's Review*, XVI (1854), 539-40.

⁴⁸ George W. Featherstonhaugh, *Excursion through the Slave States*, 2 vols. (London, 1844), I, 185.

⁴⁹ William T. Hale, *History of De Kalb County, Tennessee* (Nashville, 1915), 49.

⁵⁰ Frederick L. Olmsted, *A Journey in the Back Country* (New York, 1860), 222-23.

⁵¹ *Seventh Census*, Table XI. 318-24, for agricultural production, and Table I, 307-308 for population.

in cattle raising.⁵² This leading position was due largely to the presence of vast bodies of unimproved land, not only in the mountains and pine barrens, but interspersed all through the less fertile and swampy areas of the arable lands. The table below⁵³ gives the total area of each southern state with the improved acreage for 1850 and 1860, and it can be seen at a glance that the bulk of land in the South was unimproved.

States	Total Acreage	Improved Land	
		1850	1860
Arkansas	33,410,063	751,530	1,983,313
Florida	37,931,520	349,049	654,213
Texas	175,587,840	643,976	2,650,781
Kentucky	24,115,200	5,968,270	7,644,208
Tennessee	29,184,000	5,175,173	6,795,337
Missouri	41,836,931	2,938,425	6,246,871
Mississippi	30,179,840	3,444,358	5,065,755
Louisiana	26,461,440	1,590,025	2,707,108
Alabama	32,462,115	4,435,614	6,385,724
Georgia	37,120,000	6,378,479	8,062,758
South Carolina	21,760,000	4,072,051	4,572,060
North Carolina	32,450,560	5,453,975	6,517,284
Virginia	39,262,720	10,360,135	11,437,821
Maryland	7,119,360	2,797,905	3,002,257

The states of Arkansas, Texas, and Florida had scarcely been touched by the ax and the plow before the Civil War, and only a fraction of the land, ranging from about one-ninth of the total in Louisiana to nearly half in Maryland, had been put to agricultural uses in the other southern states.

A summary of livestock production in the southern states and in the Old Northwest, the section in the North that ranked next to the South, is presented in the following table.⁵⁴ This will show the comparative value of livestock production in the South which was so largely based upon grazing the open range.

⁵² Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: Agriculture (Washington, 1864), cxii-cxiii, cxv-cxvii, and cxviii.

⁵³ Donaldson, *Public Domain*, 28-29, gives areas of states; *Seventh Census*, Table LV, lxxxii-lxxxiii, and *Eighth Census*, Agriculture, Table I, vii, give amount of improved land of states in 1850 and 1860, respectively.

⁵⁴ Seventh Census, Table LV, lxxxii-lxxxiii,

OLD NORTHWEST

<i>State</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Horses</i>	<i>Cattle</i>	<i>Sheep</i>	<i>Swine</i>	<i>Value of Livestock</i>
		<i>Mules</i>				
Ohio . . .	1,757,556	466,820	1,358,947	3,942,929	1,964,770	44,121,741
Indiana . . .	931,392	321,898	714,666	1,122,493	2,263,776	22,478,555
Illinois . . .	736,931	278,226	912,036	894,043	1,915,907	24,209,258
Michigan ..	341,591	58,576	274,449	746,435	205,847	8,008,734
Wisconsin .	197,912	30,335	183,433	124,896	159,276	4,897,385

THE SOUTH

Virginia . . .	1,421,666	293,886	1,076,269	1,310,004	1,829,843	33,658,659
North						
Carolina ..	869,039	173,952	693,510	595,249	1,812,813	17,717,647
South						
Carolina ..	668,507	134,654	777,686	285,551	1,065,503	15,060,015
Georgia . . .	906,185	208,710	1,097,528	560,435	2,168,617	25,728,416
Alabama . . .	771,622	187,896	728,015	371,880	1,904,540	21,690,122
Florida . . .	87,444	15,850	261,085	23,315	209,453	2,880,058
Mississippi . . .	606,526	170,007	733,970	304,929	1,582,734	19,887,580
Arkansas . . .	209,897	71,756	292,710	91,256	836,727	6,647,969
Louisiana . . .	517,762	134,363	575,342	116,110	597,301	11,152,275
Texas	212,592	89,223	330,114	100,530	692,022	10,412,927
Missouri . . .	682,044	266,986	791,510	762,511	1,702,625	19,887,580
Kentucky ..	982,405	381,291	752,502	1,102,091	2,891,163	29,661,436
Tennessee . . .	1,002,717	345,939	750,762	811,591	3,104,800	29,978,416
Maryland ..	583,034	81,328	219,586	177,902	352,911	7,997,634

The relative importance of livestock production in the Northwest and the South can be more easily seen from a comparison of the average per capita ownership of livestock in each state. The table on page 165, computed from the preceding table, gives the average ownership of each person in several states in terms of dollar evaluation.

The second wave of settlers to come into the public domain were, as previously observed, the farmers and planters who desired the ownership rather than the free use of some portion of the public domain. The migratory direction of an agricultural people is determined, where there is a choice, by several factors. The agricultural immigrant far more than the herdsman has a tendency to seek out a country as nearly as possible like the one in which he formerly lived, in the matter of soil, rainfall,

THE OLD NORTHWEST

<i>State</i>	<i>Per capita value of livestock</i>
Wisconsin	\$24.74
Michigan	23.44
Ohio	25.67
Indiana	24.13
Illinois	32.85

THE SOUTH

<i>State</i>	<i>Per capita value of livestock</i>
Arkansas	\$31.67
Florida	32.93
Texas	48.98
Kentucky	30.19
Tennessee	29.89
Missouri	29.15
Mississippi	32.75
Louisiana	21.53
Alabama	28.10
Georgia	28.39
South Carolina	22.52
North Carolina	20.38
Virginia	23.67
Maryland	13.72

temperature, and appearance—that is, having similar topography, streams, trees, and grasses. The similarity of appearance is of great importance for both psychological and practical reasons. The fact that the emigrant shakes from his feet the dust of his old community does not mean that he divests himself of the mental picture and love of the old countryside, of those rich limestone valleys, rolling hills, and sandy levels where the odor of the resinous pine scents the air and the tall trees moan in the wind, or of the rugged mountains with purple shadows and smoke hanging above the cove in the late afternoon, announcing the cheery news of supper a-cooking or the still making a run. A settler simply could never be entirely happy and at home unless he was surrounded by a landscape much like the one where he had spent his earlier years. Those accustomed to rugged country seldom debouched upon the plains, but migrated to a country where there were other hills and valleys—the Ozarks, for example, were largely settled by those from the Appalachians—while those who had inhabited level country usually avoided the hills unless they could settle in a wide valley with the hills in the distance. Those who had lived in a wooded country shunned the open prairies.

Aside from sentiment that grows into acute nostalgia in strange surroundings, the agricultural migrants—though to a much lesser degree the pastoral folk—have scientific and practical reasons for selecting a country similar to the one from which they emigrate. The basic and sound assumption of the farmer who seeks a country similar in appearance, climate, and soil to the old community in which he has lived is that he can continue in the new country to grow the field crops, fruits, and vegetables, the tillage, habits, and marketing of which are part of his mental furniture. "Men seldom change their climate," observed the superintendent of the Bureau of the Census in 1860, "because to do so they must change their habits."⁵⁵ William H. Sparks, who himself had migrated west, remarked that the emigrants were sure to select their new home, as nearly as possible, "in the same parallel, and with surroundings as nearly like those they had left as possible. With the North Carolinian, good springwater, and pine-knots for his fire, were the *sine qua non*."⁵⁶ Paul Vidal de La Blache, the geographer, applies this principle to the migratory movements of the Chinese into the unsettled areas within their own country. "How," he asks, "could such individuals contrive to get along there, if unable to live in customary ways, and with customary means?" They must "find an environment similar to the one which they have been obliged to leave."⁵⁷ Isaiah Bowman observes that the primary function of the individuals who went out upon the American frontier to locate a fit place for settlement for themselves and their neighbors usually "consisted merely in finding soils and slopes that resembled those back at home that were known to be good."⁵⁸ The letters and diaries of pioneers abound with reports to those in the East that the soil and climate of the new country were like those back at home. As a result of such reassuring knowledge, "one great bugbear of pulling up stakes and removing to a distant home was greatly neutralized by this comfortable feeling that, however great the

⁵⁵ Eighth Census, *Population*, xxxv.

⁵⁶ Sparks, *Memories of Fifty Years*, 20.

⁵⁷ Vidal de La Blache, *Principles of Human Geography*, 68. Cf. Timothy Flint, *The History and Geography of the Mississippi Valley* (Cincinnati, 1832), 217.

⁵⁸ Isaiah Bowman, *The Pioneer Fringe* (New York, 1931), 6.

distance and the consequent toil, men knew toward what kind of haven they were faring and that they would meet there conditions which they had mastered before.”⁵⁹

It was soon known by the average person in the eastern states that, outside the highlands, the temperature, rainfall, and soil of the country lying to the west, until the Great Plains were approached, were sufficiently like those in the East to permit the continuation of the same types of agriculture. This information was derived from land prospectors, and the emigrant guides prepared by such writers as William Darby, who made a careful study of these and related matters; but chiefly from the reports of the herdsmen, who had raised their little patches of corn, truck, tobacco, and cotton while hunting and grazing their livestock on the frontier. By 1860 the trend of migration had been scientifically examined by the Census Office on the basis of the nativity reports in the census tables of 1850 and 1860, and the superintendent of the census was able to state the fact that “the almost universal law of internal migration is, that it moves west on the same parallel of latitude.”⁶⁰

The necessity of continuing to grow the usual crops was not the sole practical motive that prompted the immigrant farmer to settle upon land like that which he had cultivated in the East. Of great importance was the need to continue to employ the methods and tools with which he was familiar. Those accustomed to the use of certain farm implements adapted to one kind of soil had great difficulty in changing to another type of soil, even though such a change did not entail any change in their farm economy. This was particularly true of those who, having cultivated sandy or loamy soils, moved into gummy clays and lime soils. Indeed there has been since ancient times a preference

⁵⁹ Archer B. Hulbert, *Soil: Its Influence on the History of the United States* (New Haven, 1930), 78. See also, *ibid.*, 21-23; Albert B. Faust, “German Americans,” in Francis J. Brown and Joseph S. Roucek (eds.), *Our Racial and National Minorities; Their History, Contributions, and Present Problems* (New York, 1937), 171; and Laurence M. Larson, *The Changing West and Other Essays* (Northfield, Minn., 1937), 11-12, 69-70, 71, for settlement of the Northwest by Europeans from similar regions.

⁶⁰ Eighth Census, *Population*, xxxv.

among agricultural folk for a soil with a sand or silt content because of the greater ease with which it can be cultivated.⁶¹

The implication of this prejudice in favor of a country similar in climate, surface appearance, streams and springs, soil, and the natural growth of grass, timber, and wild flowers, is this: the farmers making new homes in the West were, in the majority of cases, not in search of the richest lands of the public domain, but merely the richest of the particular type of land to which they were accustomed back in the East. Perhaps in most cases they were content with land almost identical with that left behind except that the new land was fresh.

Naturally, therefore, the rural folk of the Upper South dwelling in the limestone valleys and highlands, whose pattern of farm husbandry had been the growing of grain and livestock, did not erupt into the Lower South where climate and soil would force a radical change in farm economy and methods of cultivation. On the contrary, when they migrated it was usually into the highlands, limestone basins, and valleys of Tennessee, Kentucky, Missouri, and northern Arkansas and into the wooded lands across the Ohio River, where climate, soil, timber, and the grasses indicated that the new country would be hospitable to the familiar old crops. Both Darby and Peck, in their guides for emigrants, observed this westerly trend of the agricultural migrants,⁶² and the federal censuses of 1850 and 1860 fully sustain their observations. In 1850 there were 142,102 free natives of Virginia living in the upper southern states of Missouri, Kentucky, and Tennessee, and 155,978 living in the Old Northwest; but in the lower southern states of Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas there were only 38,311 such Virginians. The Virginians had settled chiefly in the tobacco, grain, and livestock regions. Maryland exemplifies better than Virginia the zonal trend of the migration of agricultural folk. In 1850 over 30,000 free natives of that state were

⁶¹ Vidal de La Blache, *Principles of Human Geography*, 62, observes that the early agricultural communities of Europe were located on "the most easily cultivated" and "not always the most fertile" soils. "Mellow friable lands forming a sort of band from southern Russia to northern France" were the early abode of agricultural settlers. "Men began to seek out certain localities because they were easy to cultivate." *Ibid.*, 65.

⁶² Darby, *Emigrant's Guide*, 121, 231; Peck, *New Guide for Emigrants*, 62, 63, 108.

living in Virginia and Pennsylvania—obviously the western portions—, 54,310 in the Old Northwest, 12,277 in Tennessee, Kentucky, and Missouri, and only 4,722 in the seven states of the Lower South mentioned above. Thus Maryland contributed little either to the upper or lower southern states west of the mountains. North Carolina which, outside of the highlands, is essentially a state of the Lower South, had 103,315 free natives living in Tennessee, Kentucky, and Missouri, 52,467 in the Old Northwest, and 107,912 in the newer states of the Lower South.⁶³

The Carolinas settled Georgia, and, with considerable aid from Virginia, settled Tennessee. The remainder of the states of the Lower South were the children and grandchildren of the Carolinas, Georgia, and Tennessee. In 1850 there were 140,261 free native South Carolinians, 140,041 Georgians, 99,140 North Carolinians, and 79,640 Tennesseans living in the newer states of the Lower South compared with about 43,000 from Virginia and Maryland. Though Tennessee and North Carolina had contributed heavily to the upper slave states and to the Old Northwest, South Carolina and Georgia had only 12,000 free natives in that region in 1850.

The census of 1860 continues to show the westward trend of population in the South, the newer states such as Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Kentucky contributing heavily to the states in the same zones to the west.⁶⁴

The first agricultural settlers in the new farm lands in the Southwest as a rule came from the piedmont or "up-country" of the Carolinas and Georgia where they had already been engaged in the cultivation of cotton, and where the soil was similar in its clay and sand contents to much of the soil of the new country. Local pioneer writers agree that the early settlers of the Southwest—especially Alabama and Mississippi—were up-country Carolinians or Tennesseans, many of whom had originally come from up-country South Carolina. For example, most of

⁶³ *Seventh Census*, Table XV, xxxvi-xxxviii.

⁶⁴ *Eighth Census, Population*, xxxiv, and 616-23. See also, William O. Lynch, "The Westward Flow of Southern Colonists before 1861," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), IX (1943), 303-27.

the South Carolinians, who moved into Blount, Jefferson, and Pickens counties, Alabama, were from the York, Abbeville, and Fairfield districts,⁶⁵ very similar both in soil and in topography to the country in which they settled. More recent studies show that in all parts of Alabama as late as 1828, most of those immigrants whose origin could be ascertained came not from the tidewater regions of the South Atlantic states, but from the piedmont, where they had been cultivating the short staple cotton. Few of the tidewater planters migrated into the Southwest during this period, probably because their heavy investments in land, the stability of their principal money crops—rice, tobacco, and long staple cotton—and their established social position tended to hold them where they were.⁶⁶ But it may well be that the climate of the Southwest, which was not hospitable to the culture of rice, tobacco, and long staple cotton, was a decisive factor in retarding the migration from the low country.

These up-country cotton farmers and planters who settled in the newer lands, as has been suggested, selected the lighter sandy loam and sand and clay soils in preference to the stiff clays and rich black prairie lands. A. J. Brown, in his history of Newton County, Mississippi, observed that the early settlers in that region preferred the poorer sandy lands to the richer prairies and clay soils. "The prairies of the county were very open; thousands of acres of this kind of land were entirely unobstructed by timber or undergrowth, and were very easily brought into a state of cultivation. The level, sandy and uplands were much more in demand, as the people much preferred the level uplands to the ridges or prairies."⁶⁷ Nettie Powell noted the same thing in Marion County, Georgia. "The section south of where Buena Vista now is and

⁶⁵ George Powell, "A Description of Blount County," in *Transactions of the Alabama Historical Society, July 9th and 10th, 1855* (Tuscaloosa, 1855), 37-41; Nelson F. Smith, *History of Pickens County, Alabama* (Carrollton, Ala., 1856), 37-49. See also, A. B. McEachin, History of Tuscaloosa (MS. copy in Alabama Department of Archives and History; also published in *Tuscaloosa Times*, 1880); and Ezekiel Abner Powell, *Fifty Years in West Alabama* (MS. copy in Alabama Department of Archives and History; also published in *Tuscaloosa Gazette*, August 12, 1886-September 5, 1889).

⁶⁶ See, especially, Thomas P. Abernethy, *The Formative Period in Alabama, 1815-1828* (Montgomery, 1922), 25-26.

⁶⁷ Brown, *History of Newton County*, 54.

leading towards Draneville was known as 'turkey ridge,' and was not attractive to early settlers on account of the hard red clay soil [indicating rich soil] which was not easy to cultivate with the wooden plows that were then in use. The most of this region was left vacant until the middle thirties."⁶⁸

The method of migration and settlement in the South was fairly uniform during the pioneer period. Friends and relatives living in the same or neighboring communities formed one or more parties and moved out together, and when they had reached the promised land they constituted a new community, which was called a "settle-ment"—and still is so called. Settlements were frequently miles apart, and the inhabitants of a single settlement would be more scattered than they had been in the old community in the East; and other settlers would come in after the first trek in smaller groups or in single families and fill in the interstices. These later comers would often be relatives or friends of those who had come first, or friends of their friends. Frequently church congregations would move in a body into the Southwest or an entire hamlet or community would simply evacuate and march together into the "land of milk and honey." In describing the settlement of Wilkinson County, Georgia, Victor Davidson observes that "frequently large tracts were purchased and whole communities [from the older parts of the state and the Upper South] would move and settle on them. There were instances where congregations would follow their pastors here."⁶⁹ One entire community from Virginia "came in a body from that State and purchased lands near each other."⁷⁰

The migration of a family group from Abbeville, South Carolina, to Cherokee County in the Coosa River Valley of Alabama in 1835, has been described by one of the members of the group. "In November 1835," he says, "we bade adieu to friends and left the old homestead never to look upon it again. . . . Late in the afternoon of our first day's travel we were joined, as we rolled on, by my maternal grandparents

⁶⁸ Nettie Powell, *History of Marion County, Georgia* (Columbus, 1931), 21.

⁶⁹ Davidson, *History of Wilkinson County*, 147.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 162.

and several other members of the family, the party thus numbering forty or fifty souls.⁷¹ Similarly, the migration from Alabama into Louisiana and Texas about 1840 was made in groups. On one occasion, for example, "some thirty families, forming a single party, are said to have met near Clarksville, and started together in their wagons for Louisiana and Texas."⁷² One of the most interesting group migrations into the wilderness was that of the Presbyterian congregation of Bethel Church which came in a body from Williamsburg district of Columbia, South Carolina, and settled in Maury County, Tennessee, in 1808, where they established their church, "Zion," and their Zion community—which has remained virtually intact until this day.⁷³ The settlements at Watauga and in neighboring valleys, the Cumberland settlements, and those of the Kentucky bluegrass basin, such as Harrodsburg and Boonesboro, are all too well known as group undertakings to need more than mention. Such examples might be endlessly repeated. Thus the early communities of the newer states and territories were essentially transplanted organisms rather than synthetic bodies.

These groups did not move into the public domain in ignorance of their exact location; but rather, like the children of Israel, they sent their Calebs and Joshuas ahead to spy out the land and prepare the way. An early description of Blount County, Alabama, relates how the plain folk chose their location and how they made ready for the families to settle in a new community. As they prepared to move into the wilderness, the prospective immigrants usually sent

. . . a few strong men, generally their sons, without families, deep into the then wilderness in the fall, to make corn and prepare for them. The father generally went with them and chose the place, and then went back to prepare for moving when the corn was made. A bushel of meal will suffice a man one month, and if he has no other than wild meat, he will require even less bread.

⁷¹ J. D. Anthony, *Life and Times of Rev. J. D. Anthony: An Autobiography with a Few Original Sermons* (Atlanta, 1896), 14.

⁷² Ball, *Glance into the Great South-East*, 207. See also, Louise F. Hays, *History of Macon County, Georgia* (Atlanta, 1933), 112-13, 118-21, for an account of the settlement of that county, and particularly the town of Marshallville, by family and community groups from Orangeburg and Newberry, South Carolina.

⁷³ Records of the Zion Church, Maury County, Tennessee (microfilm copies in Joint University Libraries, Nashville, Tennessee).

In the fall season, place three or four men, one hundred miles in a wilderness, with proper tools and two horses, they will pack their bread stuff for the hundred miles—procure their meat—clear land—and produce corn sufficient to bread one hundred persons one year.⁷⁴

Blount County, which comprised much of northern and western Alabama at the time of the first settlement in 1816 and 1817, was settled in this fashion.

The same preparations made in the migration of families of wealth are easily traced in the case of the family of Judge Charles Tait. The Taits lived in Elbert County, Georgia, from which many of the early settlers of Alabama migrated. In January, 1817, Charles Tait commissioned his son, Captain James A. Tait, to go into the public domain of Alabama territory to select a future home for the family. The father gave careful specifications as to the type of place to select. There were certain characteristics that the place must possess, he said:

. . . such as a stream near at hand for a mill and machinery—a never failing spring at the foot of a hillock, on the summit of which a mansion house can be built in due time; that it have an extensive back range where our cattle and hogs can graze and fatten without the aid of corn houses, that on the right and left there is an extensive body of good land where will settle a number of good neighbors and from whom the pleasure and benefits of society will soon be realized.⁷⁵

In December of the same year Captain Tait wrote his father that he would go the next year to the Alabama territory, taking two or three Negroes with him, and would buy a few Negroes in Alabama, where they would make a corn crop. Later, when it was safe, the family was to be brought to the new home.⁷⁶ With several Negroes—and presumably several of his neighbors—he proceeded to the present Wilcox

⁷⁴ Powell, "Description of Blount County," *loc. cit.*, 42. See also, Brewer, History of Coosa County, 48, for the example of Joel Speigner "spying out the lands for a group back in South Carolina."

⁷⁵ Charles Tait to James A. Tait, January 20, 1817, in Charles Tait Papers (Alabama Department of Archives and History). At the time this letter was written Charles Tait was a United States senator from Georgia. See sketch in Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone (eds.), *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), XVIII, 274-75.

⁷⁶ James A. Tait to Charles Tait, December 15, 1817, Tait Papers.

County and became a squatter on the public domain, where he raised a crop of corn just as had the small farmers who came to Blount County in northern Alabama in the same year. After a year on the public domain he purchased some land at two dollars an acre; but the government held most of the land off the market and he complained to his father that "we shall have to make another crop on the public land. The failure of the sale of all the townships advertised is a grievous and most mortifying disappointment to those generally settled on the land and to us in particular."⁷⁷

In the meantime, the neighbors were moving into the Alabama territory, some of them to become neighbors of the Taits at their new home at Fort Claiborne—where a place on the bluffs of a river was selected with the requirements that met the elder Tait's specifications. The son's letters show that the trek from Elbert County had begun even before he himself set out to select a plantation. "Mr. Goode and family started yesterday for the Alabama territory," he reported in November, 1817. "Gov. Bibb will start on Thursday I believe, Esquire Barnet was to have broke ground on Thursday last, his son-in-law Taliafero, follows in about three weeks, and I suppose his son Thomas in the course of the winter. Thus you see the present inhabitants are moving off."⁷⁸

In the main outline, then, migration and settlement on the southern frontier followed a pattern. The herdsmen who combined livestock grazing with hunting pioneered the arable lands, and they were closely followed, if not pursued, by the agricultural settlers. When the best lands had been taken up by the farmers, the smaller herdsmen who had not become farmers and planters retreated with their droves of cattle and swine into the pine barrens and highlands, where they would be protected from the encroachment of agriculture by poor or rugged land.

The agricultural folk in migrating into the public domain sought a country as similar as possible to the country in which they had lived. The reasons for this were the natural love of familiar environment and

⁷⁷ *Id.* to *id.*, January 17, 1819, *ibid.*

⁷⁸ *Id.* to *id.*, November 10, 1817, *ibid.*

the necessity of continuing the accustomed farm husbandry, which only a country similar to the old one in climate, soil, and natural growth could meet. The migrants thus found themselves moving in a westerly direction along those isothermal lines or temperature zones in which they had lived in the East. Grain and cattle farmers of the Upper South remained such and settled in the Upper South to the west of the mountains and in the lower portion of the Old Northwest. Tobacco and cotton farmers did likewise and moved into the middle and lower southern territories and states. Before migrating, one or more representatives of a group spied out the land, whereupon the group—which was frequently a congregation or neighborhood—moved out together and became neighbors in the new country.

This pattern of migration and settlement had a significant bearing upon the social and economic structure of the Old South and the New. The herdsmen, who withdrew to the rugged and sterile lands in order that they might continue the occupation that they preferred, placed drastic limitations upon their own future economic well-being. As long as the pine belt and highlands were not overcrowded by man and beast, the range remained good and these semi-pastoral folk lived well and possessed a strong sense of security. They were certainly not poor whites as a class; but neither were many of them wealthy. Eventually, when these regions began to be crowded—and this was happening in a few places prior to the Civil War—the people would be compelled to graze fewer cattle and cultivate more and more land until they would find themselves farmers cultivating poor soil without much knowledge of agriculture.

Those agricultural immigrants who had deliberately shunned the fertile but tough clay and lime soils and had settled upon inferior sandy-loam lands placed limitations—though not as severe—upon their future economic prosperity in a way similar to the piney wood and mountain folk. While many became well-to-do, few became rich, for the economic level of an agricultural people can rise but little above the level of the fertility of the soil. On such lands were many large farmers and small planters with ten or fifteen slaves, but there were few if any

large planters. Those agricultural migrants who moved into the rich lands were most fortunate; for, while most who settled in the black belt were possessed of only moderate means at the time of settlement, nearly all rose greatly in the economic scale and many who were poor in the beginning became immensely wealthy before 1860. There were thus several regions differing greatly in fertility of soil, and consequently in wealth. As between these regions there was segregation; but within each region there was very little. In the black belt, for example, the property of the non-slaveholders and the great planters lay intermingled, and the census and tax lists show that the values of their lands and their agricultural productions per acre were about the same.

Ante-Bellum Attempts of Northern Business Interests to 'Redeem' the Upper South

BY GEORGE WINSTON SMITH

During the ante-bellum era of sectional conflict, energy, boundless ambition, and optimism tempered by shrewd judgment gave vitality to American business life. With regard to the conquest of the new West, a strange admixture of romanticism and materialism was emerging as "manifest destiny." Elsewhere, too, prophets looked for other Utopias which might spring forth from the soil, the forests, and the mineral wealth of older regions. Turning to potentially rich areas in the southern states, a vigorous school of American political economists predicted that varied manufacturing and scientific agricultural enterprises could produce material welfare and minimize sectional bitterness. A "harmony of interests" might garner peaceful abundance for everyone—black and white alike—from burgeoning fields and thriving mills. With their eyes upon idealized New England communities as patterns of perfection, the sanguine theorists in quest of a new El Dorado pointed to the Upper South.

The most elaborate statement of the nationalist school's precepts came from the facile pen of Henry C. Carey—Philadelphia publisher, traveler, savant, and son of the pioneering tariff advocate, Mathew Carey.¹ It would be gratuitous to assume that the son did not draw

¹ For discussions of Henry C. Carey's work, see: Abraham D. H. Kaplan, *Henry Charles Carey; A Study in American Economic Thought* (Baltimore, 1931); Ernest Teilhard, *Pioneers of American Economic Thought in the Nineteenth Century* (New York, 1936), Chapter II; John R. Turner, *The Ricardian Rent Theory* (New York, 1921), 110-42; William Elder, *A Memoir of Henry C. Carey* (Philadelphia, 1880); Merle Curti, *The Growth of American Thought* (New York, 1943), 300. Brief sketches are in Edwin R. A. Seligman, *et al.* (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, 15 vols. (New York,

somewhat upon his father's lore, or that Alexander Hamilton's sharp arguments did not influence the elder Carey's conclusions that the South needed to play an important role in economic diversification.² But in the writings of Henry C. Carey and those of his close disciples there was also a peculiar strain of agrarian philosophy. Their ideal differed greatly from the large and dirty manufacturing cities that sucked away the strength of colonial regions even while they scattered poverty among the unfortunates of Britain. Rather, Carey envisioned factory towns in green southern valleys: near dashing streams, and surrounded with pleasant fields. If factories were built, population would cluster about them; there would be a local demand for those food crops that had most value. Rich "river bottom" lands and other low-lying country might be drained, cleared of timber, and made to bear the heaviest yields. Lighter lands in the hill-country then could be fertilized and reinvigorated instead of abandoned in a wild rush to the West.³ Scientific farming, including the use of new machinery and steampower, would make southern man power more effective.⁴ With consumers near-by, the demand for perishables like butter, cheese, and cream would mean sleek herds grazing upon hillside pastures and additional

1930-1935), III, 226, and Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone (eds.), *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), III, 488-89.

²[Mathew Carey], *Common Sense: Addresses to the Citizens of the Southern States* (Philadelphia, 1829), 34-35; Mathew Carey, *The Olive Branch, or, An Attempt to Establish an Identity of Interest between Agriculture, Manufactures, and Commerce* (Philadelphia, 1820), 85; Henry C. Lodge (ed.), *The Works of Alexander Hamilton*, 9 vols. (New York, 1885-1886), I, 153, II, 298, 325; Carl W. Kaiser, *History of the Academic Protectionist-Free Trade Controversy in America before 1860* (Philadelphia, 1939), 31.

³H[enry] C. C[arey], "What Constitutes Real Freedom of Trade?" in *The American Review: A Whig Journal* (New York, 1845-1852), XII (1850), 237; John S. Skinner, "A Discourse on the Reciprocal Relations of Agriculture and Other Branches of American Industry," in *The Plough, the Loom, and the Anvil* (Philadelphia, 1848-1857), I (1848), 1-16; "Noticeable Facts in Late English Agricultural Papers," *ibid.*, 234; "Check to the Purely Agricultural Interests," *ibid.*, III (1851), 749. *The Plough, the Loom, and the Anvil* was a periodical sponsored by Henry C. Carey to disseminate his views on political economy. His close friend, John S. Skinner, who was already well known for his writings and editorial work dealing with scientific agriculture, became its first editor.

⁴"Steam Power," in *The Plough, the Loom, and the Anvil*, I (1848), 251-52; "The Reaping Machine and the Irish Laborers," *ibid.*, IV (1851), 152; Henry C. Carey, *Principles of Social Science*, 3 vols. (Philadelphia, 1858-1860), I, 384.

dollars in their owners' pockets.⁵ Fresh strawberries and other fruits would come into the towns "by the bushels," to say nothing of string beans, carrots, cabbages, and other truck crops. Freight charges, commissions, brokerages, reclamation fees, and like exactions which the South had suffered to pay "outside" merchants since pre-revolutionary times would remain, if at all, as historical oddities.⁶

Then, too, social ends might be gained. With practically every citizen a landowner some would also buy shares in the local bank, others would have a few railroad securities, and still others would be stockholders in the town's manufacturing plant. Schools would dot the countryside. And to complete the picture there would be well-painted white houses, with neatly stocked woodpiles near-by, enclosed by thrifty stone fences.⁷ Like Jefferson before him, Carey was devoted to the welfare which sprang from observance of the individual's rights. Amid illimitable natural resources the producer might triumph through voluntary co-operation with neighbors who had similar interests. Government, of course, might aid the process with protective tariff laws and other beneficent legislation, but in the last analysis well-being would result from a series of automatic adjustments dependent upon the success of bold, risk-taking entrepreneurs.⁸

It was impossible for the designers of this new social order to ignore the implications of southern Negro slavery. Nor was it surprising that, irrespective of any moral or ethical preconceptions, the reaction of the Carey school should be unfriendly on economic grounds to the "peculiar institution." Mathew Carey frowned upon the slave system as the

⁵ "Dairy Husbandry—Cheese Making," in *The Plough, the Loom, and the Anvil*, III (1851), 702-707.

⁶ "The Macon Convention," *ibid.*, IV (1851), 310-11.

⁷ "The Seven Wonders of New England in the Eyes of a Southern Traveller," *ibid.*, I (1848), 81-83; "The Iron Trade," *ibid.*, 250; "On the Effects of the Character of a Neighborhood on the Selling Price of Lands," *ibid.*, II (1849), 151; "Banks Wanted," *ibid.*, 216-18; [Henry C. Carey], "The Policy of England and Its Results," in *American Review*, IX (1849), 39-40; Henry C. Carey, *The Harmony of Interests, Agricultural, Manufacturing, and Commercial* (Philadelphia, 1851), 47-49; Henry C. Carey, *The Past, the Present, and the Future* (Philadelphia, 1859), 337.

⁸ Carey, *The Past, the Present, and the Future*, 229-30, 415-16; Henry C. Carey, *Principles of Political Economy, Part the Fourth* (Philadelphia, 1840), 100.

leading cause of undiversified and wasteful one-crop agriculture. By way of a remedy he suggested that the slaves be used to manufacture coarse cloth in southern factories.⁹ Furthermore, a staunch Carey protagonist, Hezekiah Niles, ventured to prophesy that if the slaves were given employment in diversified tasks their standard of living would rise, and their birth rate decline.¹⁰ The thesis was simple, perhaps too simple, and it remained for Henry C. Carey to give it full statement. With him it was axiomatic that where there were large amounts of land in proportion to population "wasteful methods" (e.g., slave cultivation) would prevail. Slavery might, for a time, prevent a "free labor" economy from developing. But the conditions were economic—not political. Once given sufficient inducement to enter, immigrating capital and free men would create a new society in the erstwhile pro-slavery districts. Describing the process to the New England manufacturer, Nathan Appleton, Carey argued:

The mill brings people to the neighborhood, and new demands for labor arise, and with each step there is an increase in the value of labor, and in the power of consuming its products. Houses are wanted, and stone quarries become valuable, while the demand for timber enables the land-owner to sell his trees instead of killing them. His land increases in value because of the facility of exchanging food and cotton for cloth and iron. . . . A demand arises for numerous smaller articles of food, and gardens and little farms appear, the high price obtainable for such portions of land offering to the great land-owner a strong inducement to the division of his land. The slave who has earned wages in a mill may become an owner of land, or his fellow-slave may cultivate a few acres of cabbages, and peas, and beans, required to meet the demand that has arisen, paying to his master a fixed sum in lieu of his services, retaining the balance as wages. He thus becomes a payer of rent. Each step thus made is but the preparation for a new and greater one. . . . The true way to bring about the gradual abolition of slavery must be to endeavor to increase the value of Southern land and Southern labor, to the advantage of both master and servant; a measure that can be accomplished only by an increase in the ratio of spades and ploughs, and mills, and furnaces, and other of the machinery which con-

⁹ Kenneth W. Rowe, *Mathew Carey; A Study in American Economic Development* (Baltimore, 1933), 57-58.

¹⁰ Richard G. Stone, *Hezekiah Niles as an Economist* (Baltimore, 1933), 110-11.

stitutes wealth, to population. If the Southern man desires to do this he *must* "encourage" the owners of such wealth to come, or to stay, among them.¹¹

Here was a form of the antislavery argument, emitted at a time (1848) when sectional conflict was intense; but still it was quite distinct from the clamorous verbal assaults of the Garrisonian abolitionists. Carey looked for freedom to "follow naturally from an increase in the productiveness and consequent value of slave labor," while the professional abolitionist, bent upon destruction, reached craftily for any weapon that came to hand. Even so, the techniques of Carey and Garrison were destined to supplement each other. Although the raucous abolitionist zealots ("white-faced but black-hearted fanatics," the Boston *Commercial Gazette* called them) met no more violent opposition from slaveholders than they encountered among indignant northern business men, still their abolitionist harangues tended to foster an unfavorable impression of southern society even among the civic leaders who vied with one another to urge repressive measures against anti-slavery propaganda. After a time, caricatures of "arrogant slave-holders" lolling amid their thriftless acres began to produce critical attitudes in the minds of some northern industrialists who considered progress to be synonymous with whirring shuttles and factory profits.¹² Moreover, the antislavery crusaders began to adapt their attack to several specific issues. Attributing the Panic of 1837 to the prodigal nature of

¹¹ "Letter of Henry C. Carey to Nathan Appleton on 'The Slave Question,'" in *The Plough, the Loom, and the Anvil*, I (1849), 405-10. Cf. Carey, *The Principles of Political Economy, Part the Fourth*, 199-203, 207-209; Carey, *The Harmony of Interests*, 163.

¹² On the economic arguments against slavery, see: *Sixth Annual Report of the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, with the Speeches Delivered at the Anniversary Meeting Held in the City of New York, on the 7th of May, 1839* (New York, 1839), 14-15; John G. Palfrey, *An Address to the Society of Middlesex Husbandmen and Manufacturers, Delivered at Concord, October 7, 1846* (Cambridge, 1846), 8-11; "Theodore Parker's Letter on Slavery," in *New York Tribune*, January 8, 1848; George M. Weston, *The Progress of Slavery in the United States* (Washington, 1857), 39-41. For the attitudes of some northern conservatives, see: William Lawrence, *The Life of Amos A. Lawrence* (Boston, 1888), 28; William R. Lawrence (ed.), *Extracts from the Diary and Correspondence of the Late Amos Lawrence* (Boston, 1855), 317-18; James H. Lanman, "Domestic Industry," in *Merchants' Magazine and Commercial Review* (Title varies, New York, 1839-1870), II (1840), 365-66; George M. Stearns, "Property and National Wealth," *ibid.*, XXVIII (1853), 197-98; H. G. Foote to Freeman Hunt, September 23, 1853, *ibid.*, XXIX (1853), 707-11.

southern economy, the abolitionist argument flayed allegedly dishonest southern banking methods and those cotton states which had repudiated their debts. To northern manufactures the abolitionist spellbinders promised that if "freedom" should succeed slavery in the South, stability would replace uncertainty in the nation's economic life. Freed slaves would draw wages and spend them upon manufactures; even the proverbially wasteful "slave masters" would become more reliable buyers.¹³ Thus arose a strange dilemma. Although most Yankee business men had no faith in "the disruptive and fanatical course" of the Garrisonians, they found themselves face to face with persistent warnings that the nature of southern economy would prevent a full and profitable development of the country's resources and market opportunities. So hopefully did one antislavery leader, William Jay, view this prospect that he wrote to his friend, Lewis Tappan: "the people of this country while acting with *deliberation* will do what they think will give them the *most money*. . . . I believe slavery will cease, but in obedience to the commands not of God, but of Mammon."¹⁴

Before long the antislavery indoctrination took on added significance because of the growth of manufacturing in the South. After 1840, southern textile mills, which had been surprisingly numerous though isolated and of the domestic industry pattern, began to acquire industrial features that had been made familiar by New England cotton mills.¹⁵ Indeed, some of the manufacturing communities of the South

¹³ Avery O. Craven, *The Coming of the Civil War* (New York, 1942), 141-42; Dwight L. Dumond, *Antislavery Origins of the Civil War in the United States* (Ann Arbor, 1939), 45-46; Julian P. Bretz, "Economic Backgrounds of the Liberty Party," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XXXIV (1928-1929), 250-64.

¹⁴ William Jay to Lewis Tappan, May 27, 1851, Tappan Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

¹⁵ Emory Q. Hawk, *Economic History of the South* (New York, 1934), 288; M. D. C. Crawford, *The Heritage of Cotton* (New York, 1924), 164-65; J. Leander Bishop, *A History of American Manufactures from 1608-1860*, 3 vols. (Philadelphia, 1868), II, 450; Victor S. Clark, *History of Manufactures in the United States*, 3 vols. (New York, 1929), I, 541-42, 551-58; Broadus Mitchell, *The Rise of Cotton Mills in the South* (Baltimore, 1921), 9-40; August Kohn, *The Cotton Mills of South Carolina* (Columbia, 1907), 13-20; John G. Van Deusen, *Economic Bases of Disunion in South Carolina* (New York, 1928), 262-86; Chauncey S. Boucher, "The Ante-Bellum Attitude of South Carolina towards Manufacturing and Agriculture," in *Washington University Studies* (St. Louis, 1913-1926), III (1916), 243-57.

began to approximate far more closely than Massachusetts' factory towns Henry C. Carey's design for a balanced economy and communal living. Occasionally, southern mill owners placed great stress upon the cleanliness and well-being of the villages into which the needy population of the countryside came for employment as factory operatives.¹⁶ To visitors from the North it seemed to be a fact that the poor white population was undergoing a miraculous change. As an illustration, William Cullen Bryant, on his way to Cuba in March, 1849, spent a week in the Barnwell district of South Carolina, where in describing the factory workers he wrote:

They come bare-footed, dirty, and in rags; they are scoured, put in shoes and stockings, set to work, and sent regularly to Sunday-school, where they are taught what none of them have been taught before—to read and write. In a short time they become expert at their work; they lose their sullen shyness. . . . Their families are relieved from the temptations of theft and other shameful courses which accompany the conditions of poverty without occupation.¹⁷

To be sure, Bryant felt constrained to point out that the slaves were shut out from this employment, that slave labor in the mills had not proved to be feasible. But, according to his logic, society undergoing such a transition as he observed would "restore one branch of labor, at least, to its proper dignity, in a region where manual labor has been the badge of servitude and dependence." Concentration of scattered population into community groups where it would have "the benefits of the institutions of civilized life" would also spell the death knell of the

¹⁶ Holland Thompson, *From the Cotton Field to the Cotton Mill; A Study of the Industrial Transition in North Carolina* (New York, 1906), 50-52; William Gregg to Freeman Hunt, October 22, 1849, in *Merchants' Magazine and Commercial Review*, XXI (1849), 671-72; Solon Robinson to Hunt, February 15, 1850, *ibid.*, XXII (1850), 350-51; "A Georgia Cotton Factory," in *Farmer and Mechanic* (Title varies, New York, 1844-1852), III (1847), 522; Columbus (Ga.) *Enquirer*, cited in *Niles' National Register* (Philadelphia, Baltimore, 1811-1849), LXXIII (1847), 115; Adolph B. Benson (ed.), *America of the Fifties: Letters of Frederika Bremer* (New York, 1924), 145; Broadus Mitchell, *William Gregg, Factory Master of the Old South* (Chapel Hill, 1928), especially 53-64, 121-22.

¹⁷ Cited in Carey, *The Harmony of Interests*, 44. On Bryant's journey, see Parke Godwin, *A Biography of William Cullen Bryant, with Extracts from His Correspondence*, 2 vols. (New York, 1883), II, 45-46.

environmental conditions which fostered slavery.¹⁸ Even more enthusiastic than Bryant, a correspondent of the antislavery New York *Tribune* exulted:

The cheerful homes of free workers will rapidly supplant the dingy prisons of droning slaves, and when the people have an opportunity to see how much more profitable is the silver than the cord, how much more is done by a man to whom a dollar is paid than by a *slave* whom it costs a dollar to support, they will begin to understand why South Carolina has not kept pace in prosperity with the Northern and Eastern States.¹⁹

Northern interest in the "regenerative" influences of southern manufacturing went beyond newspaper comments. Business men who could see personal gains for themselves in the growth of southern industry also were quick to applaud the new southern spirit of enterprise. Thus, Charles Tillinghast James, a New England engineer anxious to superintend the construction of machinery in southern mills, wrote articles in favor of southern textiles.²⁰ Another far-sighted machine builder printed an itemized statement of the cost of outfitting a cotton mill with the added remark that "a building at the South, with the same cost of labor and material, could be erected much cheaper than one adapted to our Northern climate."²¹ Northern periodicals which catered to applied science carried advertisements of machinery manufacturers, and praised the South's efforts to found new cotton factories. There was at least one suggestion that northern iron masters might acquire stock in the southern mills with profits made from selling them machines.²² Also, it was notable that a few skilled workers and overseers

¹⁸ William Cullen Bryant, *Letters of a Traveller; or, Notes of Things Seen in Europe and America* (New York, 1850), 345-49.

¹⁹ "'Ludwig,' correspondence of The Tribune, Charleston, S. C.," in *New York Tribune*, April 28, 1848.

²⁰ C[harles] T. J[ames], "The Production and Manufacture of Cotton: with Reference to Its Manufacture in the Cotton Growing States," in *Merchants' Magazine and Commercial Review*, XXI (1849), 492-502; Mitchell, *William Gregg*, 66-67; Robert R. Russel, *Economic Aspects of Southern Sectionalism, 1840-1861* (Urbana, 1923), 45-46; Thomas P. Martin, "Conflicting Cotton Interests at Home and Abroad, 1848-1857," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), VII (1941), 179.

²¹ "Machinery for a Cotton Factory," in *Farmer and Mechanic*, IV (1848), 313.

²² "Manufactures in Kentucky," *ibid.*, 31; "Manufactures in Georgia," in *Scientific American* (New York, 1845-), May 14, 1846, p. 2; Mark B. Cockrill, "Cotton Mills by Cotton Growers," in *The Plough, the Loom, and the Anvil*, II (1850), 426.

from the North filled vital roles in mills and iron works of the South.²³ Even the New England cotton spinners cordially greeted the South Carolina entrepreneur, William Gregg, when he went northward on a tour of observation before founding his successful mill at Graniteville. It was nonetheless true, however, that Gregg relied almost solely upon local capital from Charleston, considered the New England group his most serious competitors, and declared that if the South were going to have an era of manufacturing it would have to be of indigenous growth.²⁴

Excepting those business men who could see gains for themselves in the growth of southern manufacturing, the warmth of northern sentiment favoring the development of southern industry tended to increase in direct ratio to concern over the protective tariff. And the protective tariff was as much a political as an economic issue. When periodicals that represented the views of the Whig party mentioned southern manufactures they usually did two things at once. First, they assured the South that manufacturing was a much to be desired blessing for that section, and secondly, they promised all Southerners that a protective tariff would produce factories in the South.²⁵ If, in such a ritual, political expediency subordinated economy, a partial reason for it was that the Whig economic doctrines contained an inner contradiction: they would have southern economic life diversified so that southern leaders might support politico-economic measures favored among "pro-

²³ Kathleen Bruce, *Virginia Iron Manufacture in the Slave Era* (New York, 1931), 309-12; Bishop, *History of American Manufactures*, II, 595; "Slave Labor in Cotton Factories," in *Merchants' Magazine and Commercial Review*, XXIII (1850), 575-76; Mitchell, *William Gregg*, 62.

²⁴ Mitchell, *William Gregg*, 140; William Gregg, "Cotton Manufacture," in *Cannelton (Ind.) Economist*, April 6, 1850 (Positive enlargement print from microfilm negative, Gregg Papers, Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

²⁵ Hamilton A. Hill, *Memoir of Abbott Lawrence* (Boston, 1883), Appendix, 142-67; *Works of Samuel Dexter Bradford* (Boston, 1858), 158; "F. B. D. Jr." to the Editor of *The National Magazine*, [n.d.], in *National Magazine* (New York, 1845-1846), II (1845), 631-33; "Free Trade and the New Tariff," *ibid.*, III (1846), 347; "Ruinous Tendency of the Free Trade Policy at the South," in *Scientific American*, October 3, 1846, p. 5; "Report of the Secretary of the Treasury," in *American Review*, XI (1850), 121-22; "To the Political Reader . . . Southern Politics," *ibid.*, XII (1850), 227; [Horace Greeley], "The Tariff of 1846," *ibid.*, IV (1846), 224-25.

gressive" northern groups, but if the South developed diversified industries it would rival northern producers.

Unfortunately for nationalist theories of progress, the rivalry between northern and southern manufacturers began to appear simultaneously with the first fruits of southern diversification. Nor did this competitive spirit depend upon brief flurries of resentment over antislavery agitation in the North. On the contrary, it was essentially a protest against northern domination of southern economic life. If anything, southern hostility grew stronger as the decades passed, until at last it became identified with political disunion. On the other hand, when in the late 1840's cotton spinning and weaving developed rapidly in the South, harassed northern manufacturers looked with less than benevolent interest upon the rising threat of southern production statistics. Southern manufacturing was in itself no guarantee against sectional conflict, no universal solution for basic social problems.²⁶

Northern proponents of southern "redemption" would not easily surrender their hopes. Even while southern business leaders and politicians were fulminating against northern economic imperialism, some northern optimists were beginning to notice another instrument for the conquest of sectionalism. Though that agency seemed to have infinite possibilities, at the time of modest beginnings it simply comprised the reported fact that settlers from the North were finding homes in neglected and undeveloped areas of Virginia. Eventually, thought some imaginative northern enterprisers, it might mean that northern capital and Yankee immigrants would re-create the South in the image of

²⁶ Charleston *Mercury*, August 11, 1838, cited in *Niles' National Register*, LV (1838), 40-43; New Orleans *Crescent*, cited in *Washington Daily National Intelligencer*, April 5, 1857; *Views on the Internal Improvement System of Virginia* (Petersburg, [1854]), *passim*; *Wealth, Resources and Hopes of the State of Virginia* (Norfolk, 1857), *passim*; Philip G. Davidson, "Industrialism in the Ante-Bellum South," in *South Atlantic Quarterly* (Durham, 1902-), XXVII (1928), 405-28; Russel, *Southern Sectionalism*, especially 46-50, 55-57; Craven, *Coming of the Civil War*, 279-91; Martin, "Conflicting Cotton Interests," *loc. cit.*, 179-80, 185-87; Herbert Wender, *Southern Commercial Conventions, 1837-1859* (Baltimore, 1930), especially 76-86; John W. Higham, "The Changing Loyalities of William Gilmore Simms," in *Journal of Southern History*, IX (1943), 217-18; Philip S. Foner, *Business and Slavery* (Chapel Hill, 1941), 9-14; Robert G. Albion, *The Rise of the New York Port* (New York, 1939), 120-21.

"free labor" society.²⁷ During the 1840's and 1850's "poor farmers and laborers of Pennsylvania" bought small tracts of land at low rates from Virginia agents who "had large quantities of abandoned estates to sell." Some more affluent Pennsylvanians of the Friends' society also reached the Old Dominion and went about the business of tilling their farms.²⁸ In addition a group of New York farmers from Onondaga and Cayuga counties came to the neighborhood of Alexandria, Virginia, and secured land in Fairfax County. Near the northwestern corner of the state, Pennsylvania and Ohio families settled in the vicinity of Wheeling.²⁹ And when Rutherford B. Hayes visited western Virginia with Federal troops during the Civil War he found several communities of Massachusetts Yankees which appeared to him as prosperous islands in a sea of rural desolation.³⁰ Close to Norfolk still another group of Yankee migrants turned to truck gardening for northern city markets.³¹ A few travelers reported favorably upon these settlements, and after a time agricultural reformers and antislavery propagandists began to write exaggerated descriptions.³²

In his annual report for 1851, the Commissioner of Patents cited a

²⁷ "Northern Gentleman" to the Philadelphia *Daily Sun*, July 15, 1848, in *The Plough, the Loom, and the Anvil*, I (1848), 162-64; John S. Skinner, "What Can Be Done in Fairfax," *ibid.*, III (1851), 446.

²⁸ Philadelphia *North American and United States Gazette*, March 4, 1857; Dorothy T. Muir, *Potomac Interlude: The Story of Woodlawn Mansion and Mount Vernon Neighborhood, 1846-1943* (Washington, 1943), especially 50-69; "A Society of Friends," in *Farmer and Mechanic*, III (1847), 11; "New England and Virginia," in *Scientific American*, January 15, 1846, p. 1; Henry T. Shanks, *The Secession Movement in Virginia, 1847-1861* (Richmond, 1934), 9.

²⁹ Albany *Evening Journal*, cited in New York *Journal of Commerce*, April 6, 1857; Lewis C. Gray, *History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860*, 2 vols. (Washington, 1933), II, 920.

³⁰ Charles R. Williams (ed.), *Diary and Letters of Rutherford Birchard Hayes*, 5 vols. (Columbus, 1922-1926), II, 80, 85, 114; Charles H. Ambler, *Sectionalism in Virginia from 1776 to 1861* (Chicago, 1910), 274; J. T. Peters and H. B. Carden, *History of Fayette County, West Virginia* (Charleston, 1926), 483, 485; Edward C. Smith, *A History of Lewis County, West Virginia* (Weston, W. Va., 1920), 156, 283.

³¹ Thomas J. Wertenbaker, *Norfolk; Historic Southern Port* (Durham, 1931), 313-14; Gray, *History of Agriculture in the Southern United States*, II, 922.

³² Avery O. Craven, *Soil Exhaustion as a Factor in the Agricultural History of Virginia and Maryland, 1606-1860* (Urbana, 1926), 160-61; William Chambers, *American Slavery and Colour* (London, 1857), 162; Frederick L. Olmsted, *A Journey in the Seaboard Slave States* (New York, 1856), 213.

statement which declared that in Fairfax County lands had been purchased "by Northern emigrants, the large tracts divided and subdivided . . . and neat farmhouses and barns, with smiling fields of grain and grass . . . salute the delighted gaze of the beholder."³³ Speaking of the same "redemption," Thurlow Weed's Albany *Evening Journal* boasted: "Free labor has substituted neat white houses instead of tumble-down negro hovels, wheat fields instead of barren sand hills, fences instead of gullies, the school-house in place of the slave-pen, and the church in place of the groggeries."³⁴ Another publicist saw this northern immigration as the beginning of a test of cultures: "In all these northern [Virginia] counties, but more than all in Fairfax, the North and the South stand face to face, and survey each other with alien glances. They know each other not. How should they? How should the rich, enterprising disciple of *progress* recognize his poor broken-down, poor-gentleman brother?"³⁵ A rebuttal, carried by *De Bow's Review*, denied that the Yankee settlers as a whole had improved Virginia lands; they had made only speculative profits by "puffing" the reputations of their holdings and then selling them to newcomers from the North.³⁶

Aside from the pros and cons of propagandists, and from the standpoint of numbers, the immigration was inconsiderable. In 1860, there were only 36,695 residents of Virginia who had been born in northern states. On the basis of the 1860 census tabulations the ratio of northern-born to native-born free population of the state was only 3.66 per cent.³⁷ No doubt there was an increasing interest in the agricultural

³³ Report of the Commissioner of Patents for the Year 1851: Part II, Agriculture (Washington, 1852), 274-75; [Charles Godfrey Leland], "Editor's Table," in *Continental Monthly* (New York and Boston, 1862-1864), I (1862), 106; Charles Nordhoff, *America for Free Working Men* (New York, 1865), 32.

³⁴ Albany *Evening Journal*, cited in New York *Journal of Commerce*, April 6, 1857. Cf. Henry Chase and Charles W. Sanborn, *The North and the South: A Statistical View on the Condition of the Free and Slave States* (Boston, 1856), 55-56.

³⁵ "Virginia, Past and Present," in *Putnam's Monthly; A Magazine of Literature, Science, and Art* (New York, 1853-1857), II (1853), 201.

³⁶ "The Yankees in Virginia," in *De Bow's Review* (New Orleans, 1846-1880), XXII (1857), 621-23. Cf. Richmond *Daily Enquirer*, April 9, 1857.

³⁷ Joseph C. G. Kennedy (ed.), *Population of the United States in 1860; Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eighth Census* (Washington, 1864), 616-19. Cf. Charles

diversification of the Upper South, but a general southern interest in agricultural science extended over areas far wider than those occupied by northern immigrants.³⁸ In so far as decreasing acreage of individual farms was a criterion of diversification, Virginia could claim no pre-eminence over other southeastern states. In the decade of the 1850's, the average size of Virginia farms decreased about 4.71 per cent, but in South and North Carolina (with an 1860 percentage of northern-born to native-born free population of respectively .82 and .38) the decrease was 9.80 per cent and 14.36 per cent.³⁹ According to Professor Silas Totten of William and Mary College, many of the northern immigrants in the vicinity of Williamsburg talked to him on the subject of slavery, and confessed that since they had resided in the locality their opinions on the subject had "undergone a great change." Because, reflected Totten, "human nature is such that those who are obliged to look up to a class above them will always wish to look down upon a class below them," he did not believe there could for long be even one antislavery advocate among the northern settlers in Virginia.⁴⁰ By no means contradictory, and equally hopeless for the cause of social transformation, was an account which lamented that northern immigrants to Virginia would always remain "outsiders" without political or social influence in the state: "They are but colonists, and degraded colonists

O. Paullin, "Alexandria County in 1861," in *Records of the Columbia Historical Society* (Washington, 1897-), XXVIII (1926), 108-109.

³⁸ Craven, *Soil Exhaustion*, 122-61; Paul Murray, "Agriculture in the Interior of Georgia, 1830-1860," in *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (Savannah, 1917-), XIX (1935), 291-312; William H. Gehrke, "The Ante-Bellum Agriculture of the Germans in North Carolina," in *Agricultural History* (Chicago, 1927-), IX (1935), 143-60; James C. Bonner, "Genesis of Agricultural Reform in the Cotton Belt," in *Journal of Southern History*, IX (1943), 475-500; Arthur R. Hall, *The Story of Soil Conservation in the South Carolina Piedmont, 1800-1860* (Washington, 1940).

³⁹ Calculations based upon: Kennedy (ed.), *Eighth Census*, 616-19; Francis A. Walker (ed.), *The Statistics of the Wealth and Industry of the United States . . . Compiled from the Original Returns of the Ninth Census* (Ninth Census, Vol. III, Washington, 1872), 341. For statistics of North Carolina farms, see Guion G. Johnson, *Ante-Bellum North Carolina; A Social History* (Chapel Hill, 1937), 54-55. A change from large scale to small scale agriculture was, of course, by no means a certain indication of prosperity or economic progress. Cf. Winthrop M. Daniels, "The Slave Plantation in Retrospect," in *Atlantic Monthly* (Boston, 1857-), CVII (1911), 364.

⁴⁰ Silas Totten to Henry Sheldon, April 11, 1857, in *New York Evening Post*, April 25, 1857.

at that. They have no voice in the legislation of the State. They are unknown in the body politic, and their homes known locally simply as the 'Yankee settlement!' degraded, of course, in Virginia eyes."⁴¹ Still, there were those who thought that the regeneration of the Upper South was not a lost cause. If "chaotic and straggling emigration" could be supplanted by a well-organized plan of group emigration, the northern states might send forth a host of Yankees on a more fortunate mission of redemption.⁴²

When first mentioned in relation to the Upper South, group emigration was no novelty in American experience. As Professor Francis Bowen of Harvard pointed out in 1856, the Mormon migrations demonstrated the superiority of methods employed by ancient peoples of the Mediterranean region over more recent attempts at scattered agrarian settlement.⁴³ In a tract published in 1846, Edward E. Hale, the New England Unitarian leader, had urged an "immigrant aid" movement for the mass colonization of Texas, and, in fact, it was about then that the "Texan Emigration and Land Company" undertook to bring in settlers and dispose of Texas lands.⁴⁴ Even earlier, Thomas Hart Benton had pushed through Congress a project to put white settlers on the public lands in Florida.⁴⁵ But perhaps the most striking demonstration of this type of imperialism was offered by the New England Emigrant Aid Company. Organized in 1854 to convert Kansas into a "free labor" state through the sponsorship of mass-emigration from the

⁴¹ "'One Who Knows Virginia,' to the Editor of the N. Y. Tribune, April 4, 1857," in New York *Daily Tribune*, April 10, 1857; Charles Lyell, *Travels in North America*, 2 vols. (London, 1845), I, 131; Ruth Scarborough, *The Opposition to Slavery in Georgia Prior to 1860* (Nashville, 1933), 227.

⁴² Boston *Daily Advertiser*, May 4, 1857; Olmsted, *Journey in the Seaboard Slave States*, 304.

⁴³ Francis Bowen, *The Principles of Political Economy* (Boston, 1856), 95-96.

⁴⁴ Dan E. Clark, "Group Migration," in James Truslow Adams (ed.), *Dictionary of American History*, 5 vols. (New York, 1940), III, 396-97; Sam H. Acheson, "Texan Emigration and Land Company," *ibid.*, V, 250; "Kanzas and Nebraska," in *North American Review* (Boston, New York, 1815-1940), LXXX (1855), 114-15. For the application of group emigration to New England settlement in the Middle West, see Lois K. Mathews, *The Expansion of New England* (Boston, 1909), 241-43.

⁴⁵ Thomas H. Benton, *Thirty Years' View*, 2 vols. (New York, 1854-1856), II, 167-71; Sidney W. Martin, "The Public Domain in Territorial Florida," in *Journal of Southern History*, X (1944), 185-87.

North, the New England Emigrant Aid Company numbered among its incorporators a substantial number of capitalists. Its guiding genius, the erratic Eli Thayer, invariably stressed economic motives in his flamboyant speeches on colonization; and before long the company had begun to invest in Kansas lands with a view to retaining title to choice locations until incoming settlers could bring about an increment of their value.⁴⁶

Yet, Eli Thayer was not content with his Kansas adventure. Although he received substantial financial payments as agent for the New England Emigrant Aid Company, the Yankee promoter found Kansas to be far short of the fabled Gran Quivira. His fertile mind began to search for other and more lucrative fields where his version of "free labor" colonization and popular sovereignty might be used to better advantage. By 1856, he hit upon Virginia as a suitable sphere for new operations, and at the annual meeting of the Emigrant Aid Company in May of that prosperous election year he broached the subject of colonizing the Old Dominion with northern immigrants.⁴⁷ Afterwards, Thayer declared that at the time he made his proposal he had "large hopes of returns which would amply recompense him for his sacrifice in the Kansas work, and . . . saw in the prospective speculation in lands and in the creating of new communities connected with the movement an opportunity for himself and his associates the parallel of which had seldom

⁴⁶ "Report of the Directors of the New England Emigrant Aid Company, . . . May 26, 1857," in *Boston Daily Advertiser*, May 27, 1857; [Twenty-second] *Annual Report Presented to the American Anti-Slavery Society by the Executive Committee at the Annual Meeting Held in New York, May 9, 1855* (New York, 1855), 22; Ralph V. Harlow, "The Rise and Fall of the Kansas Aid Movement," in *American Historical Review*, XLI (1935-1936), 20-21; Russell K. Hickman, "Speculative Activities of the Emigrant Aid Company," in *Kansas Historical Quarterly* (Topeka, 1931-), IV (1935), 244; *Six Speeches with a Sketch of the Life of Hon. Eli Thayer* (Boston, 1860), 19, 37; Eli Thayer, *A History of the Kansas Crusade: Its Friends and Its Foes* (New York, 1889), 202-207, 209, 281-82; Samuel A. Johnson, "The New England Emigrant Aid Company" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1935), 356-87.

⁴⁷ *Boston Daily Evening Traveller*, May 28, 1856. For an earlier project to establish colonies of New England men in Virginia, see "'A. W. T.' to the Editor of the New York Tribune," in *New York Daily Tribune*, April 23, 1857. On the North's "power of migration" to "redeem" the South, see Calvin M. Clark, *American Slavery and Maine Congregationalists* (Bangor, 1940), 174-75.

if ever presented itself in the history of the world."⁴⁸ Even such lavish enthusiasm as this, however, did not bring a favorable response from the New England business men who had followed Thayer into the Kansas venture. Not only did they think that it was unwise to divert their energies from the unfinished work in the West, but having come to know the eccentricities of Thayer they were inclined to look upon his new hobby as "chimerical in the extreme."⁴⁹ The monomania which was later to lead Thayer into an assertion that "if there is any weak spot in the Union, I think it would be a good thing to patch it over with an additional layer of population,"⁵⁰ was already too apparent to his New England associates. At any rate, in 1856 Thayer was busy securing his own election to Congress, and it was early the following year before he could again give attention to Virginia.

During the same exciting year in which Thayer was running for Congress, John C. Underwood, a native of New York but for many years a resident of Virginia, journeyed from his dairy farm in the Shenandoah Valley to the Republican national convention which nominated John C. Fremont, and upon returning home met political and social ostracism. Underwood had long been known as a radical "free-soiler" in politics who had tried unsuccessfully to win over his neighbors to the economic views of Henry C. Carey's nationalist school. Now, in the autumn of 1856, he magnified the incivilities visited upon him into atrocities, and, traveling once again northward, made fiery if somewhat incoherent appeals against the "Southern system" from the platforms of at least a hundred Republican campaign meetings. On all these occasions he conferred privately with leading Republicans about the possibility of flooding Virginia with "free Northern laborers" and establishing in that part of the Upper South an industrial civilization.⁵¹ A

⁴⁸ Franklin P. Rice, *The Life of Eli Thayer* (Typescript copy, Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress), Chapter 20, p. 10. The quotation is Rice's, but he purports to cite directly an interview with his friend, Thayer.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 1-9.

⁵⁰ *Congressional Globe*, 35 Cong., 1 Sess., 1342 (March 25, 1858).

⁵¹ See sketch of Underwood in *Dictionary of American Biography*, XIX, 113-14; John C. Underwood to Thayer, February 7, 1857, Eli Thayer Papers (Brown University Library, Providence, Rhode Island); Turner Ashby to "George," January 17, 1857, John C. Underwood Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress); Chauncey Shaffer to

few months more of this and his plight had become a *cause célèbre*. Conservative newspapers were ready to ridicule him as "a confirmed and very crazy abolitionist," but the New York Historical Society requested him to address it on "the life and character of John Marshall," and the antislavery press carried accounts of the "proscription in Virginia" which had forced him through the agency of a vigilance committee to sell his property under an auctioneer's hammer.⁵² Representative Philemon Bliss of Ohio thought it "a deserved tribute to the Virginian exile" to address a few words in his behalf to Congress,⁵³ and as a climax of his martyrdom Underwood found himself defended in William Lloyd Garrison's *Liberator* against "The Democratic Inquisition, down South."⁵⁴

No press agent could have provided a better setting, and Underwood was not one who would allow such an opportunity to escape. Immediately he began to contact Republican editors with his plans for the "redemption" of Virginia. Already he had prepared copious statistics which demonstrated to his satisfaction the economic decadence of Virginia and its need for "free labor" civilization. Months before a similar study of southern life by Hinton R. Helper, Underwood's compilations appeared in the New York *Daily Times*.⁵⁵ Next, Underwood wrote to Eli Thayer urging that kindred spirit to "carry the war into Africa by turning the mighty engine of your emigrant aid system into my own state of Va." There were, he explained, at least a million acres of land in western Virginia near the Ohio River which were available for purchase, to say nothing of large tracts in eastern Virginia "lying upon navigable rivers[,] covered with Oak timber of great value for ship

Underwood, December 1, 1856, *ibid.*; Clement Eaton, *Freedom of Thought in the Old South* (Durham, 1940), 245.

⁵² Washington *Evening Star*, January 13, 1857; New York *Journal of Commerce*, February 9, 1857; New York *Evening Post*, January 5, 19, February 10, 1857; Worcester *Daily Spy*, December 9, 1857; New York *Daily Tribune*, February 17, 18, 1857; Philadelphia *Public Ledger*, August 12, 1857; Underwood to William K. Strong, January 1, 1857, in New York *Daily Times*, January 6, 1857.

⁵³ Cong. *Globe*, 34 Cong., 3 Sess., Appendix, 147 (January 15, 1857).

⁵⁴ Boston *Liberator*, December 19, 1856.

⁵⁵ Underwood to the Editor, January 12, 1857, in New York *Daily Times*, January 21, 1857.

building" that could be had on reasonable terms. According to the "Virginian exile," many Republicans in New York City were ready to act, and to send "schools[,] arts, free society, & respect for labor into the Ancient Dominion."⁵⁶

Possibly Thayer was already at work on the colonizing scheme. At least, in early February, 1857, he responded with alacrity to Underwood's call for action, and before long the two enterprisers met for a conference in New York. Thayer believed that a valuable first step would be to win the aid of James Gordon Bennett's *New York Herald*; for though the *Herald* had backed Fremont during the political campaign recently ended, it was a notorious baiter of abolitionist fanatics, and it might quiet southern fears that group emigration was an anti-slavery plot. Much to Thayer's satisfaction the *Herald* began to publish letters, clippings, and leading articles in favor of his enterprise.⁵⁷ Underwood, too, more often than Thayer, visited New York editors and stimulated a widespread propaganda. In particular, William Cullen Bryant's *New York Evening Post* became one of the most persistent and thoroughly radical supporters of a changed southern economy. Although Horace Greeley hesitated at first, by the third week in March his *New York Tribune* came out for "free labor" in Virginia.⁵⁸ Finally, at least one woman orator enlisted in the propaganda campaign; for a reporter noticed that Mrs. Julia Kellogg Gordon, "a lady of prepossessing appearance and pleasing delivery," lectured on "Slavery and Its Abolition Through Organized Emigration," with complimentary references to the "free and friendly invasion" of Virginia.⁵⁹

Both Thayer and Underwood were convinced that imperialistic fervor was not confined to the faithful retainers of the radical Republican party. On the contrary, they thought it advisable to seek aid from old Know Nothings and Democrats as well as from prominent New York

⁵⁶ Underwood to Thayer, February 7, 1857, Thayer Papers.

⁵⁷ Rice, Life of Thayer, Chapter 20, pp. 7-11; Elizabeth K. McClintic, "Ceredo: An Experiment in Colonization and a Dream of Empire," in *West Virginia Review* (Charleston, 1923-), XV (1938), 170.

⁵⁸ Underwood to Thayer, February 16, March 11, 21, 1857, Thayer Papers; *New York Evening Post*, February 28, March 19, April 20, 1857.

⁵⁹ *New York Daily Tribune*, April 18, 1857.

Republicans when they decided to incorporate, by special act of the New York legislature, "The North American Emigrant Aid and Home-stead Company." When, in March, the bill of incorporation came up for consideration, Horace Greeley visited Albany and gave active assistance at the legislative sessions. Underwood, however, was the most skillful lobbyist. So well did he do his work that after passing the assembly on April 1, the bill went through the senate (April 11) with twenty-two out of thirty-two votes cast in its favor, and none recorded in opposition.⁶⁰ Thayer, interested though he was in the plans for Virginia, spent little time on the formation of the company. His experience with the New England Emigrant Aid Company had convinced him that reliance upon less imaginative traits of business leaders might serve to block his expansive ambitions.

A glance at the incorporators of the newly-authorized New York group would have convinced anyone that business men figured prominently in the list. There was Rollin Sanford, portly and dignified, well known to New York City's elite as a dealer in dyewoods and a patron of the arts. A lifelong friend and former student in William H. Seward's law office, he was likewise a large stockholder in the Stamford Manufacturing Company. Other New York merchants included: John A. C. Gray, a dry goods retailer and director of the Bank of New York; William A. Hall, who had a shoe business while serving on the board of directors of the Broadway Bank; Henry H. Elliott, a trader in iron; and Edward W. Fiske. Equally outstanding in business circles was D. Randolph Martin, president of the Ocean Bank, and Richard M. Blatchford, a prominent lawyer for mercantile interests, and politically a member of Seward's antislavery faction in state politics. Then, too, there was Charles A. Stetson, proprietor of the metropolis' famed Astor House where Seward's canny old mentor, Thurlow Weed, made his home. Truman Smith, another old Whig politician, completed the city's representation. But up-state New York also could claim a goodly

⁶⁰ Rice, Life of Thayer, Chapter 20, p. 13; McClintic, "Ceredo," *loc. cit.*, 199; Underwood to Thayer, March 9, 11, 24, 28, April 2, 1857, Thayer Papers; *Laws of the State of New York Passed at the Eightieth Session of the Legislature*, 2 vols. (Albany, 1857), I, 823-25.

number of the incorporators: John L. Schoolcraft, Albany banker and brother of the ethnologist, Henry Rowe Schoolcraft; Palmer Vose Kellogg, engaged in clothing manufacturing and wholesaling at Utica, besides being the head of a clothing establishment in Chicago; Hugh White, an entrepreneur of railroads, cement works, and other ventures, who had served three terms in Congress as an antislavery Whig; James S. Wadsworth, great landowner and scion of a famous family in Genesee County. Another important influence was exerted by the Wells, Fargo and Company express line. James M. McKaye, an employee of the large transportation company, helped Underwood to draw up the charter, while Wells, Fargo's president, Edwin B. Morgan (a protege and fellow-townsman of the remarkable founder, Henry Wells), had his brother, Henry Morgan, act as an incorporator. Still, perhaps the most striking figure among all the imperialistic adventurers was Erastus Corning—president of the Albany City Bank, iron manufacturer, railroad capitalist, developer of remote lands in New York State, and political boss of the Albany Regency Democratic organization.⁶¹

The North American Emigrant Aid and Homestead Company had a program that was nearly as elaborate as its title. Factories, railroads, villages, and schools would be built in Virginia either by the company

⁶¹ New York *Evening Post*, March 21, 1857; B. C. Raymond to Mrs. Mary Howard Schoolcraft, September 23, 1863, Henry R. Schoolcraft Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress); *Munsell's Albany Directory and City Register for 1856* (Albany, 1856), 322, 434-36, 438; *The New York City Directory for 1854-1855* (New York, [1854]), 247; H. Wilson (comp.), *Trow's New York City Directory for the Year Ending May 1, 1858* (New York, [1857]), 332, 348, 726; *ibid.*, for 1857, Appendix, 14-15; *The Utica City Directory for 1856-1857* (Utica, 1856), 104-105; *Brigham's General Directory of Auburn . . . , 1863-1864* (Auburn, 1863), 265. See also, *Dictionary of American Biography* for sketches of Blatchford (II, 359), Corning (IV, 446-47), Smith (XVII, 350), Stetson (XVII, 596-97), and Wadsworth (XIX, 308-309); and *National Cyclopedias of American Biography*, 30 vols. (New York, 1898-1943), for mention of Elliott (XIII, 465) and Morgan (XIII, 218). Further information on members of the group may be found in the following: Timothy Hopkins, *The Kelloggs of the Old World and the New*, 3 vols. (San Francisco, 1903), II, 1311; N. H. Morgan, *Morgan Genealogy* (Hartford, 1869), 198-99; Carlton E. Sanford, *Thomas Sanford . . . , 2 vols.* (Rutland, Vt., [1911]), I, 465-66; E. B. Huntington, *History of Stamford, Connecticut* (Stamford, 1868), 451-52; *Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1927* (Washington, 1928), 1690; *New York Daily Times*, December 3, 1879; *Chicago Daily Herald*, October 19, 1883. For James M. McKaye's part in drafting the bill of incorporation, see McKaye to Thayer, March 13, 15, 1857, Thayer Papers.

itself or by purchasers of the company's lands. Reflecting the theories of Henry C. Carey, Thayer declared that there would be close association of agricultural and manufacturing communities. "Colonies of agriculturists" would find markets in near-by cities.⁶² With added details, an editorial in the *New York Herald* queried:

What is more natural than this new idea of emigration . . . to Virginia? There labor may be applied to the production of cotton and woolen fabrics, with the materials close at hand. There, fuel and food may be obtained in the utmost profusion at the cheapest rates. There the manufacturer may live in the midst of his own markets, and draw his food from the soil beneath his feet. . . . Far-seeing men . . . have therefore come to the conclusion that they had better apply their energies to labor in more congenial climates, and where there is plenty of fertile land.⁶³

This was, reminded the *New York Tribune*, no mere adventure in land speculation. For if the Emigrant Company bought lands and held them for high prices, taxes and assessments would prove ruinous unless it immediately brought in settlers to take over its divided holdings. In fact, northern investors who had already bought or acquired through foreclosure tracts of land in Virginia began to take an interest in the company as a means of reclaiming something from their ill-paying investments.⁶⁴ Thayer's plan called for purchase by the company of large quantities of "outworn" and uncultivated land. One-fourth of it would be given away outright to actual settlers in plots ranging from fifty to two hundred acres. Small farms would predominate. Another fourth of the land would be sold in small parcels at "slave state prices," that is, at cost, and the remaining half of the land purchase would then, with large profit to the company, be turned over to buyers at "free state prices."⁶⁵

Beyond immediate pecuniary interest, commentators on the "free labor" conquest of Virginia saw the implications of larger population movements. In the spring of 1857 there were those who were ready to

⁶² Rice, *Life of Thayer*, Chapter 21, p. 13.

⁶³ *New York Herald*, April 12, 1857.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, March 10, 1857; *New York Daily Tribune*, April 16, 1857; *Chicago Democratic Press*, cited in *Worcester Daily Spy*, April 2, 1857.

⁶⁵ *New York Herald*, February 28, March 30, 1857.

assume that speculative business hazards in the West were responsible for "frequent and dangerous fluctuations" in the East's economy. The older South and the Northeast might well join hands against the menace of runaway western land speculation by turning the tide of emigration to southern regions. In the words of one eastern editorialist: "Since the demon of speculation has set up his red flag in the West, and is attracting purchasers of lands, not for improvement, but for a rise, the immigrant in moderate circumstances will soon be driven to fresh fields and pastures still newer, to greater distances, and to cheaper soil. This is the time, then, for the South by a masterly magnanimity, which will produce them a handsome profit, to overlook all this abolition nonsense and encourage emigration to their vacant lands."⁶⁶ More forthright was Samuel Bowles' Springfield (Massachusetts) *Republican* when it asserted: "In the national and patriotic view of the question, the balance of power between the East and the West requires that the strength of the American Homestead Company should be expended on the Atlantic seaboard."⁶⁷

Discussions of the company's operations also came around to the inevitable question of the Negro's future in the Upper South. In his statistical propaganda, Underwood pointed out that the time was not very far distant when all the "border states"—Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri—would be redeemed from the influence of slavery. By the terms of his analysis there were three stages in the development of slavery. The first was a period of expansion, when in a given area slave population grew more rapidly than that of free-men. Secondly, there was a "stationary stage" or "that in which though the slaves increase in numbers they increase in a less ratio than the whites." A third or "declining stage" would be one in which the slave population had a positive decrease in numbers while free population showed an increase. Through such a trend freedom could be "attained at no distant day by the operation of natural and peaceful causes."⁶⁸

⁶⁶ Philadelphia *North American*, June 2, 1857. Cf. New York *Herald*, May 11, 1857; Washington *Evening Star*, February 13, 1857.

⁶⁷ Springfield *Daily Republican*, April 28, 1857.

⁶⁸ Underwood to the Editor, January 12, 1857, in New York *Daily Times*, January 21, 1857.

Linked with this theory was an explanation that "a natural distribution of labor"—free and slave—was in the process of evolution: Carolina, Georgia, and other states of the deep South might well need slave labor, because free labor had often proved to be ineffective in a hot climate; but the free white workman was well-suited to the Upper South and by his efficiency he might hasten the day of emancipation in those states.⁶⁹ While carefully avoiding any taint of abolitionism, the New York *Herald* assumed that: "The pressure of Northern population, speculation, and the laws of trade will thus be sufficient quietly to effect the final extinction of slavery in the existing border slave states without involving the reduction of the cash value of a single nigger, or a solitary legislative or individual act of emancipation."⁷⁰

Although these conclusions were by no means accurate, at least the census of 1860 gave a slight degree of corroboration to the thesis. For while it was true that Virginia's slave population of 490,865 was greater than that of any other state in 1860,⁷¹ the proportion of slave population to total population in Virginia was 30.75 per cent, compared with 33.24 per cent in 1850, 36.22 per cent in 1840, and 38.78 per cent in 1830—a drop of 8.03 per cent in thirty years.⁷² Equally revealing was the fact that in the late 1850's some Virginians believed that large numbers of slaves were passing out of their state in a southerly direction.⁷³ On this point the Charleston *Mercury* admitted: "The predominance of free labor in Virginia, by the natural order of things, and in

⁶⁹ New York *Daily Tribune*, May 9, 1857; Philadelphia *North American*, May 15, 1857; McClintic, "Ceredo," *loc. cit.*, 198. For the comments of English observers, see Lyell, *Travels in North America*, I, 193-94; Archibald Prentice, *A Tour of the United States* (London, 1848), 95-96. For a discussion of acclimatization and a repudiation of the "climatic theory" of plantation society, see Edgar T. Thompson, "The Climatic Theory of the Plantation," in *Agricultural History*, XV (1941), 49-60.

⁷⁰ New York *Herald*, April 25, 1857.

⁷¹ William O. Lynch, "The Westward Flow of Southern Colonists before 1861," in *Journal of Southern History*, IX (1943), 325.

⁷² Calculations based upon Kennedy (ed.), *Population of the United States in 1860*, 598-604. Cf. Philadelphia *North American*, June 23, 1857.

⁷³ Petersburg *Express*, cited in Worcester *Daily Spy*, April 25, 1857; "Roche Blanche" for the *Journal of Commerce*, in New York *Journal of Commerce*, May 4, 1857; Norfolk *American*, cited in New York *Evening Post*, April 27, 1857; Frederic Bancroft, *Slave-Trading in the Old South* (Baltimore, 1931), 291; Montgomery *Mail*, cited in Philadelphia *North American*, March 16, 1857.

the course of time, is quite possible and even probable. The slave south proper—the cotton States—must not look to frontier or border States, such as Virginia, Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri, for efficient help.”⁷⁴ With less complacency, the New Orleans *Delta* and the Cheraw (South Carolina) *Gazette* proposed as a preventive measure the abolition of the interstate slave trade so as to blockade the slave population in the border slave states.⁷⁵

It was with high hopes that Thayer, Underwood, and the rest of their coterie looked forward to the operations in Virginia. Certainly it would have been easy for anyone to assume that conditions in the South cried out for the success of the enterprise if there were the slightest degree of effectiveness in a terrific propaganda blast which pushed forward the “free labor” project. Concentrating upon the “decadence” of southern society, this propaganda attack was, for the most part, a restatement of the old abolitionist accusations against southern institutions. Virginia’s wealth, charged one critic, was neglected and permitted to lie dormant by an outworn social organization; yet this “stagnation and sleep of slavery” was “beneath the thundering of . . . thousands of waterfalls, and beside . . . millions of cotton bales.”⁷⁶ While not denying that contemporary Virginia leaders favored the construction of railroads, factories, and other improvements, the cynics scoffed that: “Magnificent flotillas have anchored, theoretically, in the waters of Virginia and South Carolina; ideal mills have buzzed by every Southern water-course; and imaginary locomotives have clanked and screamed through every Southern wilderness.”⁷⁷ Under their “helter skelter plan of canal

⁷⁴ Charleston *Mercury*, cited in Philadelphia *North American*, March 14, 1857.

⁷⁵ New Orleans *Delta*, cited in Norfolk *Southern Argus*, May 22, 1857; Cheraw *Gazette*, cited in Boston *Liberator*, May 15, 1857. For the attempt to use this northern emigration as a lever to reopen the African slave trade, see Wender, *Southern Commercial Conventions*, 177-78. For other expressed fears that the border states might be “abolitionized,” see W. J. Carnathan, “The Proposal to Reopen the African Slave Trade in the South, 1854-1860,” in *South Atlantic Quarterly*, XXV (1926), 419; W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, *The Suppression of the African Slave-Trade* (New York, 1896), 190-91; and Milledgeville *Georgia Journal*, December 4, 1821, cited in John R. Commons, *et al.* (eds.), *A Documentary History of American Industrial Society*, 10 vols. (Cleveland, 1910-1911), II, 69.

⁷⁶ Chase and Sanborn, *The North and the South*, 64.

⁷⁷ New York *Daily Tribune*, April 24, 1857.

and railway improvements," Virginians had "run themselves soundly into debt, private and public" with "repudiation" the threatened outcome.⁷⁸ The thirty million dollar railroad debt had not only put a heavy strain upon banking and credit, but had also resulted in heavy taxation for the state's property holders. Croaked one editorial writer: "Unless the laboring force of Virginia is recruited from some such force [as northern immigration] she will not pay interest on her debts five years longer."⁷⁹ Railroads of themselves, even if they were completed, could not reinvigorate the state and restore its finances, unless there were an influx of industrious farmers and factory hands. In the South, the population deficit created by westward migration had not been filled, as in the North, by immigrants from Europe. The question, said Greeley's *Tribune*, was "whether she [Virginia] can go to work without an infusion of new blood."⁸⁰

Similarly, the propagandist argument lamented that, relative to neighboring states, Virginia's lands were decreasing in value to "merely nominal prices." And when indignant defenders of the Old Dominion published the results of a recent assessment to show that the total value of its real property was \$376,000,000, or an increase over the 1850 assessed valuation of 36 per cent, they were met with the scornful rejoinder that this was but the actual valuation of "the little island of New York," and that owing to the influx of gold from the West prices had increased by at least a similar amount.⁸¹ Virginia newspaper advertisements of farms offered for sale by owners leaving for the West were noticed in the hostile northern press with comments such as: "abandoned estates, deserted habitations, and impoverishment stare her

⁷⁸ "'One Who Knows Virginia' to the Editor of the N. Y. Tribune," in *New York Daily Tribune*, April 10, 1857; *New York Evening Post*, March 2, 13, 1857.

⁷⁹ *New York Evening Post*, April 6, 1857.

⁸⁰ *New York Daily Tribune*, March 18, April 8, 1857. Cf. *New York Herald*, June 9, 1857; *Philadelphia North American*, April 27, June 16, 1857.

⁸¹ *New York Evening Post*, April 6, 7, 28, 1857. In 1854 the Virginia real property tax was doubled—from two to four mills. One student of taxation has concluded that this was because of the increased market value of Virginia lands. See Edgar Sydenstricker, *A Brief History of Taxation in Virginia* (Richmond, 1915), 58-62.

[Virginia] in the face everywhere."⁸² The New York *Evening Post* claimed that it had "a schedule of properties offered for sale in different parts of the state by a single agent or broker, amounting in all to more than two and a half million acres, and for which the price asked is *twelve and a half cents an acre.*"⁸³ Equally extravagant was Underwood's boast that one Virginian with "land of good title (much of it coal land)" was eager to sell his 300,000 acres at fifty cents per acre.⁸⁴

No doubt many residents of Virginia wished to attract northern capital to their state during the 1850's. For example, in 1854, the Virginia board of public works was "gratified" to learn that its extensive advertisements for proposals to furnish "rails, castings, and cars" had attracted attention in "various highly respected quarters" in the northern states. And the board saw fit to intimate "that the occasion presented a fair opportunity for men of means and proper capacity to erect, in the favorable coal and iron regions upon which the road will be located, establishments for the manufacture of the various articles enumerated."⁸⁵ Only three years later Virginia newspapers were remarking that "several enterprising Pennsylvanians" had "secured 20,000 acres of the best iron ore land in the State," close to the line of the Virginia Central Railroad, and had begun the manufacture of iron.⁸⁶ The Richmond *Whig* went so far as to profess a belief that "central Virginia, with her abundance of minerals, and all the resources to make iron cheaper than at any other place, will yet become the Birmingham of America."⁸⁷

"All Virginia is for sale," exulted Rollin Sanford, and this from one of the most prominent business men in the Thayer-Underwood company. The optimistic statement, however, was something of a trib-

⁸² New York *Herald*, June 14, 1857; Philadelphia *North American*, March 16, April 21, 1857; Boston *Liberator*, May 15, 1857.

⁸³ New York *Evening Post*, February 26, 1857.

⁸⁴ Underwood to Thayer, March 28, 1857, Thayer Papers.

⁸⁵ *Thirty-Eighth Annual Report of the Virginia Board of Public Works to the General Assembly of Virginia* (Richmond, [1854]), viii.

⁸⁶ Washington *Evening Star*, January 6, 1857; Norfolk *Southern Argus*, January 12, 21, 24, 1857.

⁸⁷ Richmond *Whig*, cited in Norfolk *Southern Argus*, January 12, 1857. Cf. Alexandria *Sentinel*, cited in Washington *Daily National Intelligencer*, January 19, 1857.

ute to the salesmanship of Alexander Dudley, president of the Richmond and York River Railroad, who had shortly before that called at Sanford's office. At least, from the nature of the arrangement that Dudley tried to make with the northern promoters, it would appear that the propagandists' notion that Virginians were anxious to sacrifice their property for a mere pittance was nothing more than fancy. It would seem nearer the truth that Virginia sellers were trying to capitalize upon northern investors' optimism. For, being a man of imagination, though with a reputation for steadiness in business, Dudley made to Sanford the startling proposition that members of the new "emigrant aid" company should buy a controlling interest in the Richmond and York River Railroad and its proposed terminus, West Point, Virginia. At the time, the grading of the road was nearing completion but the rails were not yet laid. In addition, Dudley wished to include some farm property near the junction of the Pamunkey and Mattaponi rivers which the West Point Land Company (Dudley was also president of this company) had purchased two years before and laid out into town lots and streets. Negro quarters of the W. P. Taylor farm were there, as well as the remnants of an old tobacco warehouse, a stone fort dating back to the Revolutionary era, an ancient burying ground, and a barn which Dudley's company had transformed into a hotel, set amid a grove of locust and aspen trees. Dudley wished Sanford and his associates to subscribe in full an impending \$500,000 railroad bond issue, purchase \$180,000 of the railroad's stock, and finally, take the five hundred acres of land that comprised West Point for \$20,000. If they needed them, the Yankee financiers could secure one or two thousand adjacent acres at forty dollars per acre.⁸⁸ Nor was that the only offer of the kind. Underwood himself made an excited public announcement that through Captain William K. Smith, "an intelligent business man of Fredericksburg, Virginia," the council of that city had offered

⁸⁸ Rollin Sanford to Thayer, March 28, 1857, Thayer Papers; Lyon G. Tyler (ed.), *Men of Mark in Virginia*, 5 vols. (Washington, 1906-1909), IV, 109; Thomas F. Bagley (comp.), *West Point, Virginia, and King William County* (Richmond, 1888), 3, 14-21. For a progress report on the York River railroad, see Richmond *Daily Enquirer*, March 16, 1857.

to sell the Fredericksburg Water Power Company to the North American Emigrant Aid and Homestead Company in "cordial good will."⁸⁹

In their search for speculative business opportunities the "free labor" colonizers did not completely forget the matter of public opinion in Virginia, but they tended to depreciate its importance. Throwing aside the martyr's role which he had assumed so effectively a short while before, Underwood wrote: "I am much mistaken if the hungry politicians will not receive us with open arms—Just tell them that we have a large amount of money to invest & they will come to us 'like turkeys to a blind.'"⁹⁰ More conservative voices, however, urged caution. Sanford, for instance, inferred from his talks with Dudley that Virginians might be willing to make business agreements with northern investors, but at the same time be "very scary" and "afraid as the Dl of Yankees."⁹¹ Virginia's governor, Henry A. Wise, reacted in exactly that way; while protesting that he would "from policy and without fear encourage immigrants to come to our waste lands and improve them," he was just as ready to fulminate against "any association or combination, formed under any pretext, coming into our limits with the avowed or manifest purpose of impairing the value of our property in slaves."⁹²

In the beginning, the reaction of the southern press was somewhat mixed. With reference to the general plan of "free labor" immigration, the Norfolk *Argus* announced that although it could not admit "Virginia's need for action," the citizens of that state were "prepared to welcome to her genial soil all good people who are disposed to respect her laws and institutions."⁹³ Also, the Richmond *Whig*, which had favored diversification and progress through new industries, felt constrained to admit that it had "no insuperable objection to intelligent, moral, industrious, enterprising and well meaning persons from

⁸⁹ Underwood to the Editors, June 1, 1857, in New York *Evening Post*, June 1, 1857.

⁹⁰ Underwood to Thayer, March 11, 1857, Thayer Papers.

⁹¹ Sanford to Thayer, April 7, 1857, *ibid.*

⁹² Henry A. Wise to Albert Gallatin Jenkins, August 24, 1857, in Barton H. Wise, *The Life of Henry A. Wise of Virginia* (New York, 1899), 211-13. See also, Clement Eaton, "Henry A. Wise, A Liberal of the Old South," in *Journal of Southern History*, VII (1941), 492-93.

⁹³ Norfolk *Southern Argus*, March 6, 1857; McClintic, "Ceredo," *loc. cit.*, 189.

the North" if they would make their permanent homes in Virginia "and adopt themselves to our institutions."⁹⁴ But, after a few days reflection, the *Whig* added an opinion that northern colonization might offset any of its benefits "by the introduction of a horde of Abolition voters" who would establish upon the ruins of southern social organization "the corrupt, dangerous, anarchy-producing system of free society which prevails in the Northern States."⁹⁵ As for the Richmond *South*, it could see no economic benefits whatsoever in the coming of the Yankees. "So far," it reasoned, "as they [immigrants from the North] devote themselves to agriculture, they come in competition with the labor of our slaves. So far as they devote themselves to the mechanic arts, they will reduce the wages and supersede the employment of our native artisans. Do our farmers think the labor of their slaves is too productive? If not, let them repulse the colony from Massachusetts." It was "a crusade against slavery—a propagation of Black Republicanism," and "Eli and his Mammonites" would have to choose "between a rope and a grape-vine as the least ignominious instrument of summary justice."⁹⁶ Thus too, the Richmond *Enquirer*, following a few days of prudent silence, gave as its judgment that it detected "the devil in the vestments of a friend." The "underground operators of abolitionism . . . while parading the plough, the loom, and the anvil as their insignia" would wait to see if "the wooden horse would be admitted into Troy."⁹⁷

There were those in the Emigrant Company who believed they might forestall southern hostility by taking certain precautions. Fully aware that Eli Thayer had been in the midst of sectional conflict in Kansas, Rollin Sanford proposed to him that any negotiations with Virginians should be carried on in the company's behalf by individuals who had no reputation for partisanship.⁹⁸ During its early stages, reports of the

⁹⁴ Richmond *Whig*, cited in New York *Herald*, March 10, 1857.

⁹⁵ Richmond *Whig*, cited in New York *Daily Tribune*, March 18, 1857.

⁹⁶ Richmond *South*, cited in New York *Daily Tribune*, April 10, 1857. For other citations, see also, New York *Journal of Commerce*, April 6, 1857, and New York *Evening Post*, May 1, 1857. Cf. St. Louis *Leader*, May 2, 1857.

⁹⁷ Richmond *Daily Enquirer*, March 14, 1857.

⁹⁸ Sanford to Thayer, April 7, 1857, Thayer Papers.

company's progress stressed the prominent "front" names of Erastus Corning and James S. Wadsworth. Likewise, there was no careful definition of the locale where it might operate; one account merely stated that the company was empowered to settle on land in any state or territory of the Union.⁹⁹ But it was in vain to hope that the irrepressible Thayer would consign himself to anonymity. Quite otherwise, he wrote to New York newspapers a series of letters on colonization which touched upon a whole array of controversial topics. In an especially belligerent message to James Gordon Bennett, printed in the *Herald* on March 30, he warned the South that if "the constitution and the laws" failed to give proper protection to the northern colonists in Virginia, "popular sovereignty must be invoked for the Old Dominion as it has been for Kansas. We shall not be intimidated. . . . If half of us were hung or shot, the rest would press on toward the shining dollars even though they should rush 'Into the jaws of death.'"¹⁰⁰

Such an outburst only served to reinforce the misgivings of Virginians. Openly attacking the stupidity of Thayer's balderdash, the New York *Herald*'s Richmond correspondent advised that from then on the "free labor" company's route would be "a thorny one."¹⁰¹ Though the Washington *National Intelligencer* tried to cajole Southerners into dismissing the whole emigration scheme as a vision "quite as chimerical and veracious as any which flattered our infant sense in the tales of Fairyland," the Richmond *Enquirer* answered Thayer in an editorial on "the Abolition Plot Against Virginia."¹⁰² Even the Norfolk *Argus*, which had been less critical than other eastern Virginia newspapers, made it clear that although it wished for immigration of free white men, it desired Yankees less than any other group.¹⁰³ Other Virginians

⁹⁹ Washington *Daily National Intelligencer*, April 17, 1857; New York *Daily Tribune*, March 21, 1857; Boston *Daily Advertiser*, Match 23, 1857.

¹⁰⁰ New York *Herald*, March 30, 1857.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, April 25, 1857. Cf. New York *Tribune*, cited in Norfolk *Southern Argus*, April 30, 1857.

¹⁰² Richmond *Daily Enquirer*, April 3, 1857; Washington *Daily National Intelligencer*, April 4, 1857.

¹⁰³ Norfolk *Southern Argus*, April 1, 1857. For other southern newspaper reactions, see: Newberry (S. C.) *Rising Sun*, undated clipping in Thayer Papers; an extensive editorial in Thayer's handwriting, copied from the Richmond *South*, April 28, 1857, *ibid.*

considered it to be their duty to take up the crusade against "the Black Republican Colony" about to be foisted upon them. And to summarize their indignation, the valedictorian of Washington College's class of 1857 exhorted: "Virginia will still maintain her proud position in the galaxy of the Union, and go on her way of prosperity in spite of Eli Thayer with his stringbeans, pumpkin pies, and 'freedom.' "¹⁰⁴

Changed attitudes in the North soon began to mark the effects of southern opposition. Bryant's New York *Evening Post* sadly deplored the circumstance that Virginians by their "open mouthed" denunciations were choosing the "road to ruin."¹⁰⁵ With unfeigned satisfaction the abolitionist *Liberator* looked upon the whole affair as just another demonstration that the slaveholders were impervious to reason. If the North American Emigrant Aid and Homestead Company were to succeed it would have "to seek another field" for its operation.¹⁰⁶ And, in fact, publicity did begin to be showered upon other districts which the company might develop to better advantage than eastern Virginia. One newspaper letter detailed the attributes of Tennessee for organized emigration. Northern Missouri, said another reporter, called for aid. Possibly, also, "advancing columns would cross Kansas to Western Texas and Eastern New Mexico" territory, or, the "current of emigration" might be "diverted to Utah." There was another reminder that Kentucky was ready for "free labor," and Thayer himself was quite willing that the important border state should have it. At least he was more than ready to second the New York *Herald*'s nomination of western Virginia "with her virgin soil, her splendid forests, her manufacturing and mineral resources."¹⁰⁷

Clement Eaton, "The Resistance of the South to Northern Radicalism," in *New England Quarterly* (Baltimore, 1928-), VIII (1935), 228; Eaton, *Freedom of Thought in the Old South*, 239-40.

¹⁰⁴ Lexington (Va.) *Gazette and General Advertiser*, July 9, 1857.

¹⁰⁵ New York *Evening Post*, April 6, 1857.

¹⁰⁶ Boston *Liberator*, April 24, 1857.

¹⁰⁷ "J. W." Correspondence of the N. Y. *Tribune*, April 7, 1857, Charleston, E. Tenn., in New York *Daily Tribune*, April 23, 1857. See also, New York *Evening Post*, April 15, 1857; Thayer to James Gordon Bennett, April 21, 1857, in New York *Herald*, April 25, 1857; Worcester *Daily Spy*, April 25, 1857; Boston *Daily Advertiser*, June 9, 1857.

On the whole, western Virginia gave an encouraging reception to the imperialists. In the vicinity of Wellsburgh, where for many years there had been a manifest interest in both antislavery and manufacturing, enthusiasts held meetings to voice their approval.¹⁰⁸ Deplored the opposition that had sprung up in parts of Virginia, the Wellsburgh *Herald* predicted that if all of western Virginia would only support "free labor" immigration the "hills and hollows" would be "populated with free white men," and within a very short while that section of Virginia would "acquire the importance not only in the Councils of the State but of the nation to which she is entitled."¹⁰⁹

On May 7, the company's subscription books were opened at a meeting in the Astor House. Within an hour's time, it was claimed, those who gathered there had subscribed enough stock to meet the company's minimum capitalization requirements.¹¹⁰ Later in the month, Thayer felt sufficiently encouraged by the response of western Virginia to take a prospector's tour of the Upper Ohio Valley. After addressing a number of audiences and conferring with residents, he finally agreed to buy the plantation of Thomas Lee Jordan, a Wayne County slaveholder who owned land on the south bank of the Ohio near the mouth of the Big Sandy River.¹¹¹ With that as a beginning, the Yankee investor then acquired adjoining property, and returned to the East to submit his purchase for ratification to his company's directors. Their approval was forthcoming, but Thayer, according to a statement made in later years, was ready to go ahead regardless of the inclinations of his New York

¹⁰⁸ *Wheeling Intelligencer*, cited in *Alexandria Gazette and Virginia Advertiser*, February 23, 1857; *Ashland (Ky.) American Union*, cited in *New York Evening Post*, June 10, 1857; McClintic, "Ceredo," *loc. cit.*, 200; Kenneth M. Stampp, "The Fate of the Southern Anti-Slavery Movement," in *Journal of Negro History* (Washington, 1916-), XXVIII (1943), 20-22; Arthur C. Cole, *The Whig Party in the South* (Washington, 1913), 4; Henry H. Simms, *The Rise of the Whigs in Virginia, 1824-1840* (Richmond, 1929), 13-14; "Wheeling," in *Niles' National Register*, LXIX (1846), 309.

¹⁰⁹ *New York Evening Post*, June 3, 1857; Levi McCormick, to the *New York Herald*, June 15, 1857, in *New York Herald*, June 22, 1857; *Wellsburgh Herald*, cited in *Boston Daily Evening Traveller*, August 21, 1857.

¹¹⁰ *Norfolk Southern Argus*, May 12, 1857.

¹¹¹ Virgil A. Lewis, *History of West Virginia* (Philadelphia, 1889), 682; McClintic, "Ceredo," *loc. cit.*, 199-200; Rice, *Life of Thayer*, Chapter 21, pp. 8-9, 11.

associates.¹¹² As he soon was to discover, all was not well within the organization, and late in June a business man and director, Henry H. Elliott, frankly questioned whether or not it was "planted upon" a "firm basis." He warned: "You want your stock in more certain hands—and you want men in your organization of higher quality, greater force, stronger moral power. As we are we *may* succeed if God favors us—but success will depend upon Providential arrangement & favours more than upon our own ability."¹¹³

Elliott's wariness was somewhat characteristic of shrewder eastern investors' misgivings in the pre-panic days of 1857's early summer. And when, in July, it was revealed that not all of the company's \$200,000 minimum capitalization had been fully subscribed, the dissatisfaction among disgruntled stockholders practically resulted in dissolution. Irate investors, fearing the obligations they had already assumed under the terms of the charter, refused to take more shares. Thayer, who had returned to western Virginia, allowed Underwood to accept the thankless task of holding the company together. In hectic letters, Underwood wrote of his attempts to prevent "an utter explosion of our company," and at a critical meeting promised the assembled directors, probably without Thayer's knowledge or consent, that Thayer would take an additional \$60,000 of the stock.¹¹⁴ At length, the board of directors adopted resolutions that permitted subscribers who wished to do so to escape further liability by returning the shares they had already taken. A committee was then appointed to secure new subscriptions with the understanding that there would be no purchases of land or equipment by the company as such until the shares should be sold. Hindered by the panic which began in August, the new subscription list made little

¹¹² Rice, Life of Thayer, Chapter 21, pp. 11, 20-21. It was about this time that Thayer leased his "valuable water privilege" in South Worcester to a group of Worcester business men. Worcester *Daily Spy*, May 19, 1857.

¹¹³ Henry H. Elliott to Thayer, June 29, 1857, Thayer Papers.

¹¹⁴ The New England Emigrant Aid Company also had encountered difficulties with its charter provisions respecting stockholder liability. See Robert E. Moody, "The First Year of the Emigrant Aid Company," in *New England Quarterly*, IV (1934), 148-55.

headway, and so far as the company was concerned the adventure was over.¹¹⁵

In view of early pretensions, it was ironical that Thayer should name his colony Ceredo for the Roman goddess of bountiful harvests. Borne by the New England promoter and just a few associates, the western Virginia community was a financial liability.¹¹⁶ Only a thin stream of immigrants reached the promised land before the Civil War.¹¹⁷ Though he was too ardent a propagandist to admit failure, Thayer's unstable enthusiasm began to lead him to other fields; soon he was talking about a self-financing, cotton-producing, missionary activity (or "Christian Colonization") in Africa, and he waxed still more vehement about the duty of reclaiming Central America with a "free labor" migration from the United States.¹¹⁸ To be sure, in 1858, he tried to interest a group of nationally-known political figures in a pilgrimage to his western Virginia community, and although polite regrets testified to the indifferent success of his junket, some congressmen did make the journey with him. During the next year he continued his efforts to win financial backers among his colleagues in Congress, while he quietly admitted to Underwood that if he could interest others his "public duties" were "so heavy" that he would even consider selling part or all of his own holdings in the colony.¹¹⁹

In itself the North American Emigrant Aid and Homestead Company and the "free labor" project it embraced was but a small undertaking

¹¹⁵ Underwood to Thayer, July 28, 29, 1857, Thayer Papers; Resolutions and memorandum in John C. Underwood's handwriting, [n.d.], *ibid.*

¹¹⁶ McClintic, "Ceredo," *loc. cit.*, 234.

¹¹⁷ The total population of Wayne County in 1860 was but 6,747. See Kennedy (ed.), *Eighth Census*, 518; *Wheeling Intelligencer*, cited in New York *Daily Tribune*, August 23, 1861; Jacob R. Dodge, *West Virginia: Its Farms and Forests, Mines and Oil Wells* (Philadelphia, 1865), 125.

¹¹⁸ Rice, Life of Thayer, Chapters 23, 26; "Self-Supporting Missionary Colonization," in *New Englander* (Title varies, New Haven, 1843-), XVI (1858), 847-53; Benjamin Coates, *Suggestions on the Importance of the Cultivation of Cotton in Africa, in Reference to the Abolition of Slavery in the United States through the Organization of an African Civilization Society* (Philadelphia, 1858).

¹¹⁹ Horace Greeley to Underwood, August 15, 1858, Underwood Papers; Thayer to Underwood, March 14, 1859, *ibid.*; Reuben E. Fenton to Thayer, July 7, 1858, Thayer Papers; John Sherman to Thayer, April 20, 1859, *ibid.*; McClintic, "Ceredo," *loc. cit.*, 254.

—albeit well-suited to the spirit of a feverish speculative season. In larger perspective, the company represented an immature system of business enterprise that only stood at the portals of a great industrial era. It was a business enterprise which, still dominated by mercantile capitalism, strove against the hampering influence of southern opposition.¹²⁰ Rugged leaders of Erastus Corning's ilk were quite capable of schemes to occupy Virginia lands as a first step in thwarting southern economic independence. As a corollary inference, such a variant of "squatter sovereignty" might quash the dangerous antislavery sectional conflict in politics.

While Thayer was preparing to fly off on new crusades and northern business men were enmeshed in the Panic of 1857, John C. Underwood came to the conclusion that there was but one remaining course left open to him if he were going to make secure his own fame and "redeem" the Upper South. Prospects of harmonious "progress" through southern manufactures had foundered in the shoals of southern economic separatism, and had smashed against the rocks of northern competition. Northern plans to "regenerate" the Upper South through "free labor" immigration had met head-on the cry of "Black Republicanism." Yet, remembering that his own ambitions ran in the direction of politics, Underwood was intent upon trying a last alternative: complete reliance upon the favors of northern antislavery politicians. If an aggressive political party based in the North could secure control of the federal government, slavery would be dealt a death-blow; the slave power's opposition to "free-labor" civilization would be at an end. As a New England editor prophesied: "The moment power is taken from the South, and we have demonstrated our capacity to conduct the government, we are safe. The slave power, having lost its hold, becomes of small account. There will be no difficulty then in so ordering the affairs of the nation that the interests of free labor shall be developed and protected. Emancipation parties will be formed in the South."¹²¹

¹²⁰ For an interpretation of northern economy on the eve of the Civil War, see Louis M. Hacker, "The American Civil War: Economic Aspects," in *Marxist Quarterly* (New York, 1937), I (1937), 191, 201, 210-11.

¹²¹ Springfield *Republican*, cited in *Worcester Daily Spy*, August 25, 1857.

Already in 1857, Underwood, through his work in the North American Emigrant Aid and Homestead Company, had come into close touch with William H. Seward's New York political machine. This opportunity he continued to improve, speaking for Seward in New York and assuring that leader of his radical antislavery views. In 1859 he was rewarded with a letter from the Republican National Committee chairman, Seward's friend, Edwin D. Morgan, who inquired about Underwood's choice for Republican national committeeman in Virginia.¹²² And from Seward himself Underwood received the confidential opinion: "You & I so well understand that there is an Emancipation interest in the South on which we ought to build, and that the danger we are now running into is that of ignoring this interest and fostering the on[e] that builds on Popular sovereignty ground for the purpose of ultimately strengthening the Democratic party & subduing the struggle for free States."¹²³

Underwood was not hesitant about accepting Seward's "higher law" suggestions. In the month of John Brown's execution, jittery Governor Wise ordered local Virginia officials to be on guard lest Underwood, the former promoter of peaceful "free labor" immigration, should distribute inflammatory literature in the state.¹²⁴ Certain it was that less than a year later Underwood provided Lydia Maria Child, a prominent woman abolitionist, with a mailing list of Virginians to whom she could send pamphlets that preached a doctrine of prosperity through emancipation.¹²⁵ Forcefully she stated her beliefs:

With regard to taking up the waste lands of Virginia, I believe there would be a rush of emigration if slavery were abolished. . . . While Virginia continues to be a Slave State, only mean and servile Yankees will take up their abode there. The better portion of our population will prefer cold, distant, uninhabited Minnesota, because it is Free Soil. In addition to the mine of gunpowder, on which the slaveholders are always standing, our emigrants dread and abhor

¹²² Edwin D. Morgan to Underwood, June 7, 1859, Underwood Papers; William H. Seward to Underwood, March 19, 1859, *ibid.*

¹²³ Seward to Underwood, November 20, 1858, *ibid.*

¹²⁴ A. R. Boteler to Henry A. Wise (with Wise's endorsement), December 17, 1859, *ibid.*; Underwood to Adams Express Company, December 17, 1859, *ibid.*

¹²⁵ Lydia Maria Child to Underwood, October 26, November 15, 1860, *ibid.*

the Lynch law which is the violent product of a system of violence. . . . Emancipation would effectually wet the dangerous mine of gunpowder, and attract free laborers and capitalists, like a powerful magnet acting upon metals.¹²⁶

To none other than Henry C. Carey, Underwood wrote that he was still, in Lincoln's election year, of a mind with Carey that it was necessary to place the loom by the side of the plow, but that he was convinced economic change did not govern the course of slavery.¹²⁷ Rather, slavery governed the course of economy. Exterminate the slave system, and economic progress would follow. This implied the use of force—not redemption, but destruction. From that point the logic of events ran on to its inevitable conclusion. A month and a day after the first shots were fired at Charleston, the *New York Times* carried a leading article under the caption, "The New Virginia." It read in part: "Without the rebellion the North would not have gained a foot of free soil from the South. With it, it will soon have the great portion of its territory as a prize, which will a hundredfold compensate for the losses sustained by the great outbreak."¹²⁸ War itself was but another mode of fulfilling imperialist ambitions in the Old Dominion.

¹²⁶ *Id.* to *id.*, December 6, 1860, *ibid.*

¹²⁷ Underwood to Henry C. Carey, November 6, 1860, *Henry C. Carey Papers* (Edward Carey Gardiner Collection, Historical Society of Pennsylvania Library, Philadelphia).

¹²⁸ *New York Daily Times*, May 13, 1861. Cf. [Daniel Lord], *The Effects of Secession upon the Commercial Relations between the North and the South* (New York, 1861), £7.48; Weston, *Progress of Slavery*, 70-71.

Incidents of the Confederate Blockade

BY KATHRYN ABBEY HANNA

The American Civil War was an international as well as a national crisis. During the four years when Federal and Confederate armies fought it out on one battlefield after another, there hung in the balance more than the number and nature of governments—more even than differing economies or systems of labor. Furthermore, the spread of international complications extended beyond the rivalry of "old King Cotton with young King Corn," as one writer expresses it, or the employment of labor in Lancastershire textile mills, or the attitude of Europe for or against the "peculiar institution" of the South. Wrapped up in the package of issues concerning the survival of the United States as one nation was to a very real degree the fate of the Western Hemisphere and the shifts of balance of power on a global scale.

When it was finally decided that the United States should continue an undivided existence, she moved once more along the road to dominance and power which she had found prior to 1861. The rise of the Republic to a strength potentially equal to that of the leading states of the Old World had already stirred apprehensions and sounded alarms in many directions. Among the neighbors of the Americas, it had earned her the dubious title, the "Colossus of the North." Britain's diplomacy more than once tried unsuccessfully to check the expansion of her ambitious offspring, while France, although less articulate, was none the less disapproving. It was a new and disconcerting departure for an order existing for several centuries: new because heretofore no great state had developed outside of Europe, and disconcerting because it injected another factor into the already intricate balance of international affairs. Following swiftly on the heels of this ominous develop-

ment in the West arose a chain of domestic events capable of liquidating the menace. The war between the states was the only real opportunity ever afforded for the frustration and destruction of American pre-eminence in the West and ultimate influence in the world at large.

The men whose task it was to direct in these crucial times realized the stakes involved. Both Abraham Lincoln and William H. Seward, the latter long an expansionist, knew the weight of destiny in the burden they bore. Across the Potomac, Judah P. Benjamin, "perplexed and infuriated" at the refusal of Britain and France to seize the ready-made opportunity to eliminate a rival, kept insisting that the Confederacy was fighting their battle for them.¹ In fact, the Confederacy stood ready to exchange support of new imperial ventures in the Americas for recognition and aid. Russia glimpsed in a strong United States a counterpoise for her late enemies of the Crimean War. Prussia, soon to be reincarnated as the German Empire, admitted the advantage of Western Hemisphere competition for England and France, although she held scant sympathy for a government based on democratic institutions. Napoleon III voiced his policies frankly in a letter to General Elie Frédéric Forey as the curtain rose on the Mexican drama in 1862: "It is to our interest that the United States be powerful and prosperous, but it is not at all to our interest that it should control the entire Gulf of Mexico, should dominate from there the Antilles and South America, and should be the sole distributor of the products of the New World."² England was "complacent" over the prospect of division in the United States and even after the second election of Lincoln to the presidency and the victories of General William T. Sherman, correspondents depicted her as sitting in "sullen content—that the longer the effort continues the more sure will be the ruin of the Great Republic."³ But

¹ Rembert W. Patrick, *Jefferson Davis and His Cabinet* (Baton Rouge, 1944), 189.

² Napoleon III to General E. F. Forey, July 3, 1862, in A. Malespine, *Solution de la Question Mexicaine* (Paris, 1864). This is one of numerous pamphlets published in France and circularized in Mexico. Such pamphlets made considerable impression, judging from the frequency with which they are quoted and discussed in the Mexican papers. The letter appears also in Genaro García (ed.), *Documentos Inéditos ó Muy Raros para la Historia de México*, 36 vols. (Mexico City, 1905-1911), XIV, 9-19.

³ London Letter of "Monadnock," November 25, 1864, in *New York Times*, December 18, 1864. "Monadnock" was London correspondent of the *New York Times*.

the most penetrating comprehension of history in the making was the prophetic speech of Benjamin Disraeli to the House of Commons on March 13, 1865: "I have often heard statesmen, and distinguished statesmen, mumble over the balance of power in Europe. It has appeared to me always to be a great mistake when we look to the distribution of power to confine our views to Europe, because we shall find, and perhaps speedily find, that there are other influences in other quarters of the globe which will interfere with our calculations."⁴

Why this recognition of realities did not produce a more aggressive course of action on the part of Europe is not the province of this article. Suffice it to indicate that such was the international framework with which the foreign policy of the Confederacy was surrounded and the background of the Union blockade proclaimed by Lincoln on April 19, 1861.

It is difficult to write adequately of the blockade. This is partly because running the blockade was a secret, unlawful process flourishing best when little was known about it. Specific data has been gathered concerning vessels captured and confiscated, but information about successful exploits still contains a certain amount of conjecture. But the blockade also presents hazards by its many-sidedness. It was an international question, one of three great blockades of modern times—the first arising out of the Napoleonic Wars, the last from World Wars I and II. The area covered exceeded that affected by the British Orders in Council against Bonaparte's Empire by five hundred miles,⁵ while the principles upon which it rested bore striking similarities to those laid down by Great Britain during the earlier struggle and hotly repudiated by the United States of that date. It was a novel experience for Great Britain to watch her own procedures thus turned against her. Although she protested constantly against incident after incident, she always bore in mind that the time might come when precedents being established would stand her in good stead. In fact, she acquiesced with

⁴ Speech of Disraeli before House of Commons, March 13, 1865, as reported in *New York Herald*, March 27, 1865.

⁵ James M. Callahan, *Diplomatic History of the Southern Confederacy* (Baltimore, 1901), 167.

such forbearance in the existence of the blockade that it roused the ire of Confederate authorities.⁶ The London *Times* stated the case for the man in the street: "A blockade is by far the most formidable weapon of offense we possess. Surely we ought not to be overready to blunt its edge or injure its temper."⁷ A more official view was that of Sir Roundell Palmer, Solicitor General: "England has as strong an interest as any power in the world in understanding well what she is about, when she is invited to take a step that may hereafter be quoted against herself and may make it impossible for her, with honour or consistency, to avail herself of her superiority at sea."⁸ Never were foresight and discretion better rewarded, because during World War I chapter and verse of the experience of 1861-1865 were quoted to great effect.⁹

The United States was also well aware of the consequences, future as well as immediate, hovering over her every act. "It is also obvious that any belligerent claim which we make during the existing war, will be urged against us as an unanswerable precedent when [we] may be ourselves at peace," wrote Seward to Lincoln in April, 1863.¹⁰ More than once advantage was sacrificed to respect for legal precedent and treaty. The question of trade with Matamoros was a case in point.

Issues involving trade between neutral nations and Confederate ports were not the only problems of the blockade. There was the matter of commerce between the United States herself and regions, such as Mexico or the West Indies, so strategically placed that traffic with the enemy was inevitable.

The attempted closing of the southern seacoast had its domestic as well as its foreign aspects. While ships slipping in and out of her bays and harbors on dark nights provided supplies necessary for the Confederate war effort, they exerted a questionable influence on south-

⁶ James P. Baxter, 3rd, "The British Government and Neutral Rights, 1861-1865," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XXXIV (1928-1929), 9-12.

⁷ London *Times*, February 10, 1862.

⁸ Quoted in Baxter, "British Government and Neutral Rights," *loc. cit.*, 13.

⁹ Samuel F. Bemis, *Diplomatic History of the United States* (New York, 1936), 377, 596.

¹⁰ William H. Seward to Lincoln, April 24, 1863, in "Papers Relating to Belligerent and Neutral Rights," in *American Historical Review*, XXXIV (1928-1929), 87.

ern economics. It was tempting to grow crops with which to run the blockade instead of planting foodstuffs, or to invest in cargoes rather than build needed industries; and so many yielded to the temptation that the states as well as Richmond tried to regulate crops planted and commodities "run in." In 1864, Jefferson Davis complained that "50 or 60 millions have gone into blockade-running while not a new dollar has gone into manufacturing."¹¹

Blockade-running became a profession for those engaged in it, and a source of speculative investment for capital, not only in the South and abroad, but even for the hated Yankees. Profits were high when there were profits. The *Banshee*, for example, made 700 per cent for her owners before her capture on her ninth voyage,¹² and many a shrewd Confederate provided himself with a tidy balance in some foreign bank as a nest-egg against defeat.¹³ Losses were equally high, especially for those who had speculated on margin, so to speak. As Confederate fortune declined and the cordon of cruisers tightened, these folk suffered heavily, even to the verge of bankruptcy.¹⁴

In 1861 blockade-running was largely on the improvised basis undertaken by slow, small craft and coast steamers which had lost their usual business. Later, ships were constructed for the purpose—long, low vessels of about 400 to 600 tons and piloted by such skillful captains that the United States refused to exchange them when they were taken prisoner.¹⁵ All who were interested in Gulf commerce participated in the traffic—Spaniards, Cubans, Mexicans, and French, but the British most of all. Indeed blockade-running has been termed

¹¹ Speech of Jefferson Davis before Manufacturers Convention, May, 1864, in *Augusta Chronicle*, May 26, 1864.

¹² Thomas E. Taylor, *Running the Blockade* (London, 1897), 85. For an estimate by President Davis of the profits made by those engaged in blockade-running, see *War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, 129 vols. and index (Washington, 1880-1901), Ser. IV, Vol. III, p. 952.

¹³ Letter of "Monadnock," March 4, 1865, in *New York Times*, March 21, 1865.

¹⁴ "London Correspondent," December 3, 1864, in *New York Herald*, December 25, 1864.

¹⁵ Gideon Welles to Edwin M. Stanton, August 6, 1862, in *Official Records*, Ser. II, Vol. IV, p. 346. See also, Francis B. C. Bradlee, *Blockade Running during the Civil War* (Salem, Mass., 1925), 79-80.

"an extraordinary instance of British energy and enterprise."¹⁶ Centers in the Gulf were Bermuda, Nassau, Havana, and Matamoros, in addition to southern ports, bays, inlets, rivers, or wherever a boat could be landed unobserved and goods stored. As time went on, Florida with its maze of intricate, unsettled coast came to be regarded as especially advantageous, an opinion which the rum-runners and German spies of the next century were to share. Commodities, munitions, and medicines were brought to the neutral ports from Europe to be exchanged for cotton, tobacco, and turpentine from the South. This completed, the goods were smuggled home, along the southern coast from the West Indies, or across the Rio Grande from Mexico. Storing wares in neutral places and clearing ships for neutral ports roused the old controversy concerning the "broken voyage" and "ultimate destination of goods."

Of course the larger merchant houses such as John Fraser and Company of Charleston, and Fraser, Trenholm and Company of Liverpool maintained fleets of blockade-runners and carried large cargoes of munitions, coal, iron, cotton, tobacco, and other commodities.¹⁷ Not all enterprises were of this magnitude, however, and typical of the lesser luminaries might be cited the ventures of William A. Swann and his associates.¹⁸ Swann was a resident of Fernandina, Florida, where he had held an important position with the Florida Railroad, which ran from Fernandina to Cedar Key and was the darling of antebellum Senator David L. Yulee of that state. After the invasion of the Union forces into the area at the mouth of the St. Johns, Swann wandered into blockade-running, becoming a blockade broker. He managed the ventures, collected the goods or the capital to buy goods, procured a vessel, hired the professional captain and crew, accompanied its voyage, traded its cargo, and returned the profits to his customers together with special purchases which they requested. His own profit consisted of the opportunity to share in the investment,

¹⁶ James Ford Rhodes, *History of United States from the Compromise of 1850*, 7 vols. (New York, 1892-1906), V, 397.

¹⁷ Patrick, *Jefferson Davis and His Cabinet*, 237.

¹⁸ The material for the story of Swann's blockade-running is found in the William A. Swann Papers (Florida State Library, Tallahassee).

plus commission on all sales. This was usually a modest five per cent, although his captain received twice as much. His clients were both individuals and companies: David L. Yulee was one of them, also Savage Brothers of Jacksonville, the Florida Railroad, and others. Some, for example Yulee, gave him money for produce for the trade; others contributed the goods themselves or provided hands for loading the ship. One associate sent him four bales of cotton.

Swann's first "adventure" was the *Silas Henry*, destined for Cuba with a cargo of cotton. The *Silas Henry* was purchased in December, 1862, at Tampa. Before she had more than left the bay, the following January, she was sighted by the Federals. Swann and the crew escaped to shore, leaving the vessel in flames. The associates lost \$7,615.72 in two months.

"Adventure to Cuba No. 2" had a happier, more profitable fate. Swann, backed by an enlarged group of associates, purchased the *Elisha Beckwith* for \$400, loaded it with 42 bales of cotton and set out early in March, 1863. Reaching Havana, he not only disposed of his cotton but of the ship as well, the latter at a neat profit of \$650, to Joseph D. Golding and Company, a blockade-running firm. Through J. W. Dever he bought a third, larger vessel, the *Marie*, for \$2,100. The *Marie* was probably a captured craft condemned by the admiralty court at Key West and sold at auction. Such was the usual procedure for confiscated blockade-runners and the sales attracted buyers not only from the West Indies but even as far away as New York.

With a thus enlarged horizon of enterprise and a few more clients garnered in Cuba, Swann bought merchandise, rum, brandy, and a small amount of medicines and munitions, and finished his commissions. One item was a toupee costing \$12.25 for Dr. W. H. Stringfellow of Gainesville, Florida. For some reason which cannot now be determined, Swann did not return to Tampa, but put in at Mobile. Again there followed profitable trading and renewed scouting for cargo, but just as the *Marie* was prepared to sail, an unexpected offer for both ship and load presented itself in the person of a Mr. Stickney. The transaction was too tempting to be resisted; so the deal was struck in

May, 1863. It was Swann's last trip. He journeyed back to Florida through Alabama and Georgia to avoid the Yankees at Pensacola, and soon afterward became sub-agent for the Confederate War Department in charge of its blockade-running projects. His headquarters were Gainesville, Florida.

The investments with Swann were not large, ranging from a few hundred up to a thousand dollars, but the profit was excellent. Not all the clients took their gains in cash; for example, the Florida Railroad accepted railroad supplies, and some of the planters received articles for farm use. Yulee, who invested \$1,453 in gold and bank notes, more than doubled his capital in two months. Rates of increase for the others were similar. How many of these small investors and blockade brokers existed it is impossible to say, but available evidence indicates that they ran into scores, especially in the more isolated portions of the coast.

Across the Gulf from Florida was Matamoros, center of another chain of circumstances of blockading. Great as the distance was between them, it was not as great as the variation of roles they played in this movement. Before the outbreak of war, Matamoros was a place of no importance across the Rio Grande from Brownsville, Texas; but from this unprepossessing start it suddenly emerged into "a great centre of commercial activity, rivalling the trade of New York or Liverpool."¹⁹ Not all the boom can be credited to the Confederacy, since the French invasion of 1862 and the resulting withdrawal of General Benito Juárez' forces to the north soon made it the sole remaining port of entry from the Atlantic for the Mexican Liberals. Border issues arose at once, not only from the exchange of contraband goods for cotton but also from the conduct of Union consuls and sympathizers who incited desertion among the Confederate recruits and encouraged hoodlums and bandits to stage raids and generally create turmoil across the Rio Grande. Since the Mexican officials belonged to the supporters of Juárez they were supposed to be pro-Federal, but

¹⁹ John Bassett Moore (ed.), *A Digest of International Law*, 8 vols. (Washington, 1906), VII, 716.

they tried to preserve an uneasy neutrality amid protests from both sides. On the one hand the government refused to forbid Confederate ships from entering her ports;²⁰ on the other, it protested the acts of the United States consul at Matamoros in behalf of United States interests.²¹ As might be expected, full rein was given to the new commercial opportunities, not only at Matamoros but throughout northeastern Mexico. Many a Mexican family of that region is reported to have owed much of its fortune to this means.

As usual, the British wasted no time in exploiting the new field. Trade flourished to such a degree that by 1863 a steamship service was begun with London; some time later the large houses of Liverpool and Manchester joined in sending ships with "super cargoes" for Matamoros to be exchanged for cotton. To make the transaction more effective, agents were dispatched across the line to procure the return cargo in San Antonio and other places. Once the cotton was actually purchased, the agent engaged mules and teams for the trip southward, a matter of thirty to thirty-five days. Cotton could be bought in Texas for five or six cents per pound, but by the time transportation costs and taxes, Confederate and Mexican, were added it rose to thirty-six or forty cents per pound. Since cotton in England brought fifty cents per pound at its low price and vastly more at its high, the profit was from twenty per cent upwards. The amount of cotton thus exported was enormous. One report gives eighty to eighty-five thousand bales from January, 1863, to February, 1864.²² Actual loading was done at Boca del Rio because large ships could not go to Matamoros, thirty-two miles upstream.

Other nations shared in this lucrative cotton trade—Spaniards, Frenchmen, and even Northerners whose patriotism winked at turning a penny to their country's harm. Exports from the Atlantic coast increased so rapidly that Washington grew suspicious, and thereby

²⁰ Matias Romero to William H. Seward, June 4, 1861, in *Relaciones Exteriores de México* (Archivo General de Relaciones Exteriores, Mexico City), Caja 1861-1867, Legajo 17-11-24.

²¹ Manuel Dobladó to Thomas Corwin, June 2, 1862, *ibid.*, Expediente 11-HI-5.

²² Correspondent writing from Matamoros to *New York Herald*, February 18, 1864, *ibid.*, Legajo 14-28-44, Expediente H/252 (44:72) /117.

arose another question of international law and treaty rights between Mexico and the United States. The Americans attempted to make short shrift of the Matamoros trade by three lines of action: first, the seizure and confiscation of foreign ships on the theory of the "continuous voyage"; second, the curtailment of undesirable trade between United States ports and Matamoros at the point of embarkation; and, third, the dispatching of Federal troops to take possession of the Rio Grande, at least near its mouth. None of these projects was happy in either its selection or its result, since that which was beneficial from a military standpoint was either politically undesirable or patently illegal.

The *Peterhoff* case demolished the plan to include the mouth of the Rio Grande in the Confederate blockade.²³ The *Peterhoff* was an English vessel captured on February 25, 1863, near St. Thomas by the U.S.S. *Vanderbilt* and sent to New York for trial. She was en route to Matamoros from London with a cargo which contained among other things army supplies, such as harnesses, boots, blankets, horseshoes, medicines, shovels, and spades. On board were three gentlemen, part owners of the cargo, who intended opening a mercantile house at Matamoros. All were British-born; two were British subjects, the third, a Mr. Redgate, was a naturalized American and recent resident of Texas. Although Seward had previously expressed an opinion that "Our right to blockade the mouth of the Rio Grande, for the purpose of preventing this commerce [with Matamoros], may be considered as at least questionable,"²⁴ the admiralty court at New York condemned the ship and its cargo. The owners appealed the case to the Supreme Court and won a reversal in 1866. This was of course after the end of the war but since the writer of the opinion, Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase, was a member of Lincoln's cabinet prior to his appointment to the Court, one is inclined to believe that his legal views were expressed

²³ The principal facts in the *Peterhoff* case are presented in Moore (ed.), *Digest of International Law*, VII, 715-18. For a somewhat fuller discussion of this and other cases growing out of the operations around Matamoros, see Frank L. Owsley, "America and the Freedom of the Seas, 1861-1865," in Avery O. Craven (ed.), *Essays in Honor of William E. Dodd* (Chicago, 1935), 220-43.

²⁴ Seward to Edwin M. Stanton, March 13, 1862, quoted in Moore (ed.), *Digest of International Law*, VII, 782.

and respected in that body. At any rate, the government had already begun to follow the course of the Court's opinion before it was rendered.

The legal complications in the case arose from the fact that Article VII of the treaty of 1848 between the United States and Mexico provided explicitly for free use of the Rio Grande by the citizens of both countries and forbade the interruption of trade by either, even for the purpose of improving the navigation, without the consent of the other.²⁵ Justice Chase ruled, therefore, that the mouth of the Rio Grande could not be included in the blockade, hence goods owned by neutrals which were actually en route to Matamoros could not be attached. He also ruled that "neutral trade to and from a blockaded country by inland navigation or transportation is lawful . . . therefore, that trade between London and Matamoras, even with intent to supply from Matamoras goods to Texas, violated no blockade and can not be declared unlawful."²⁶ Efforts were made to distinguish between goods unquestionably destined for Matamoros and those suspected of slipping across the river to Texas, but the British countered by claiming that trade with Matamoros was permitted to American vessels and that differentiation of cargo before landing was impossible. "It might so happen," wrote Lord John Russell, the British Foreign Secretary, "that all the goods carried from London might be used in Mexico, and all the goods sent from New York might be transported by land to Texas."²⁷ Furthermore, the effect of the *Peterhoff* decision was that cargoes bearing evidence that the Mexican city was their destination could not be attached even if the lighters carrying them from the

²⁵ The text of the treaty is in William M. Malloy (comp.), *Treaties, Conventions, International Acts, Protocols, and Agreements between the United States of America and Other Powers, 1776-1909*, 2 vols. (Washington, 1910), I, 1107-21. It also appears with an extended critical discussion in Hunter Miller (ed.), *Treaties and Other International Acts of the United States of America*, 7 vols. to date (Washington, 1931-), V, 207-428.

²⁶ Quoted in Moore (ed.), *Digest of International Law*, VII, 717. The Court made a distinction in the cargo, however, condemning part of it as contraband and requiring the owners of the ship to pay the costs of the case.

²⁷ Lord John Russell to Lord Lyons, April 24, 1863, quoted in Mountague Bernard, *Historical Account of the Neutrality of Great Britain during the American Civil War* (London, 1870), 314.

mouth of the river might stray across to the enemy bank.²⁸ Ships were frequently seized by the United States for unloading in the American section of the Rio Grande. The *Will o' the Wisp*, the *Science*, the *Volant*, the *Dashing Wave*, and the *Teresita* found themselves in this predicament. The first four were released with cargo, on payment of costs for voluntarily anchoring in American waters. The *Teresita's* costs were refunded because of the fact that she had drifted across the line.²⁹ Thus, although everyone frankly admitted the disadvantage to the United States, the leak of goods—it was a cascade rather than a leak—could not be plugged without treaty violation, a risk the United States could not afford to take.

Treaty obligations also frustrated the efforts to hold suspicious goods in United States ports. Restrictions on cargoes from Boston and New York to Matamoros in American ships began as early as July, 1861. They took the form of withholding clearance papers until the cargo was loaded and subsequent refusal if it contained material likely to be exchanged for Confederate cotton. Matias Romero, the Mexican minister to the United States, protested against this procedure as a treaty violation and a virtual extension of the blockade to Mexico unless the policy was accepted by his government. He contended also that increases in Matamoros trade could not be laid solely at the door of Texas markets. The war had closed overland routes to Mexico from the North through St. Louis and New Orleans, thereby forcing all exports to the Atlantic shipping centers. The issue was delicate, inasmuch as Mexico jealously guarded herself from Yankee interference and British vessels clearing from the same ports for Matamoros were not detained. Nevertheless the United States was not disposed to back down, insisting that while inconvenience to a friendly neighbor was regretted, the process of limiting exports within the nation itself was no extension of the blockade and the harm to the Union from unregulated commerce would be too great to risk.³⁰

In spite of the "painful impression" of this policy on Mexico, it

²⁸ Moore (ed.), *Digest of International Law*, VII, 717-18.

²⁹ Bernard, *Neutrality of Great Britain*, 318.

³⁰ *Correspondence between [Mexican] Legation at Washington and the State Depart-*

would likely have continued indefinitely had not two circumstances intervened. The proclamation of Lincoln against the export of arms, issued in November, 1862, removed such material from further argument. At the same time the beginning of the French invasion of Mexico soon deprived the Juaristas of all their available Atlantic ports except Matamoros. Had the Federal government persisted in its position, the effect would have been to continue trade with such places as Vera Cruz, controlled by the French whom the United States opposed, and to deny aid to the Mexican Liberals whom it favored. Accordingly, the restrictions were relaxed. After New Orleans was recaptured and reopened to commerce in May, 1863, the same issue arose once more. Military authorities of that city maintained that eighty per cent of cargo for Matamoros was intended for Texas, and that instructions permitted the suppression of trade suspected of going to the enemy. If Mexico objected to limitation of her commercial treaty, she should at least see that it did not operate to the injury of the United States. Protest and defense were still being exchanged when Imperial forces aided by their French allies occupied the cause of the controversy, as a result of which the Juárez government dropped the subject, there being no object in advancing the interests of the enemy.³¹

The sending of Federal troops to occupy the mouth of the Rio Grande late in 1863 had raised high hopes in the North that the vexatious situation at Matamoros would be speedily brought under control. The expedition was not only expected to occupy Texas and

ment about Export of Arms, in a collection of bound pamphlets in Biblioteca Nacional, Mexico City. Some of this correspondence is also in *House Executive Documents*, 39 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 1, Part 3, pp. 535 ff.

It is interesting that the position of the British regarding a similar situation, the trade between United States ports and Nassau, was at variance with that of Romero. "A neutral port in the neighbourhood of one which a belligerent is actively blockading is ascertained to be carrying on a busy trade with the blockaded port. . . . Is the belligerent bound to permit goods to be dispatched from his own ports, under his own eyes, to swell the stores of that depot? . . . And is he disabled from making such regulations by the circumstance that, under a general clause in a Treaty of Commerce, there is to be reciprocal freedom of trade between the people of the neutral country and his own, subject to the laws of the two countries? This would not, I think, be a reasonable construction of the Treaty." Bernard, *Neutrality of Great Britain*, 307.

³¹ Sebastian Lerdo de Tejada to Romero, January 8, 1865, in *Correspondence about Export of Arms*, loc. cit.

break up Confederate relations with northeastern Mexico, but also to watch the Mexican scene closely without becoming involved therein.³² French forces were supposed to be moving in the direction of the Rio Grande and it was more than ever vital to prevent co-operation between them and the Southerners. However broad might have been the original concept of this Texas venture, it dwindled to a relatively small force under General Nathaniel P. Banks which occupied Brazos Santiago, Point Isabel, and Brownsville in September, 1863. Even at that the move caused the Confederates acute if needless distress, because Matamoros was not only an important entry for commerce but also the channel of extensive negotiation and intrigue with the Mexican leaders in Nuevo León and Tamaulipas.³³ Actually the presence of the Federal troops represented a nuisance instead of a hindrance. Entrance and exit to Mexico merely moved west to Eagle Pass. From there the cotton trains passed down to Monterey, approaching Matamoros in perfect safety from the Mexican side. The return journey followed the same route.

Brownsville remained in Union hands for less than a year, September, 1863, to August, 1864. Reasons for its evacuation crowd to one's mind. A real conquest of Texas was an impossible undertaking in 1863 and possession of Brownsville alone did little to check the obnoxious traffic. As long as the blockade was inapplicable to the Rio Grande no move could be made against foreign shipping, while the gathering menace of French occupation bristled with occasions for trouble, something to be avoided at all costs. During the summer of 1864, civil war broke out in Matamoros, a three-cornered affair involving not only Imperial and Juárez sympathizers but rival generals, such as Manuel Ruiz and Juan N. Cortina, whose ability to plague the

³² *L'Estafette* (Mexico City), October 9, 1863. *L'Estafette* was a French newspaper begun at the time of the French occupation and continued until the approach of Maximilian's fall. It was close to the French authorities and reflected the French purposes, interpretations, and points of view. It is one of the best source materials of the French period in Mexico. For examples of similar support of the Federal venture by newspapers in the United States, see *New York Daily Tribune*, December 7, 1863, and *Washington Chronicle*, December 19, 1863.

³³ J. Fred Rippy, *The United States and Mexico* (New York, 1926), 234 ff.

peace of the frontier had been previously demonstrated. In spite of the determination of the United States to stay out of the fray, and stern orders to consuls and officers, there was constant play and intrigue back and forth.³⁴ It was sound if disappointing judgment to retire from such a turbulent and futile scene. The Federals started demobilizing their supplies in midsummer and by September had abandoned all points except Brazos Santiago.³⁵

The following month Matamoros was invested by Imperial forces moving overland from Monterey and French cruisers ascending the river.³⁶ The city was a prize for the Imperialists, partly because its customs duties were no small financial item, partly because the loss of revenue and commodities imported inflicted such a severe blow on the struggling Juaristas. The French always claimed that the possession of Matamoros explained much of the ability of the Juárez forces to keep on fighting.³⁷ With Maximilian's partisans in Matamoros and the Confederates under General James E. Slaughter back at Brownsville, relations across the river exuded friendship and good will. The Rio Grande presented an odd sight with Federals at Brazos Santiago, Confederates at Brownsville, French at Matamoros, and Juaristas farther west. The camp fires of all four "in hostile array" could be seen along the banks.³⁸

Meanwhile life at Matamoros grew "bigger and better." Population increased until the city, which had formerly boasted eight or ten thousand, now claimed fifty thousand inhabitants.³⁹ Commerce reached new heights under the favor of the imperial regime. In November, 1864, it was reported that "80 ships" were only waiting for the harbor to be cleared to enter the river,⁴⁰ probably only a slight exag-

³⁴ Marshal Francois A. Bazaine to Colonel Garnier, March 2, 1865, and "Report to Colonel John S. Ford, commanding at Brownsville, from Mexican officers of Mexican Army in voluntary exile in Brownsville," October 4, 1865, both in *Relaciones Exteriores de México*, Legajo 14-3-1, Expediente H/504.2 "854-67"/1.

³⁵ *L'Estafette*, September 12, 1864.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, October 3, 1864.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, August 20, 1864.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, October 11, 1864.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, March 3, 1865.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, November 11, 1865.

geration as other sources had reported earlier that from sixty to eighty ships were constantly coming and going, loading and unloading.⁴¹ With this wealth and prosperity, the city fathers improved public works, planned for street cars and a port on the Gulf at Jesus Maria—it must be remembered that the city was thirty-two miles up the river—and even acquired a girls' school.⁴² Although he was by no means a happy or welcome addition to the community, the United States Consul, E. Dorsey Etchison, remained at his post until February, 1865, and withdrew only when Maximilian ordered the revision of all consular exequaturs. Since, in view of the policy of Washington, Etchison could not be accredited to an unrecognized government, he asked for his passports. The episode drew the ire of the naval commander at Brazos Santiago but General Tomás Mejía, in charge of Matamoros, assured him of the safety of American residents.⁴³

The Imperialists claimed to observe at least a nominal neutrality. Occasionally they protested the capture of vessels in Mexican waters by Confederates.⁴⁴ According to General Slaughter's testimony, given after the war ended, they refused to sell arms to southern forces.⁴⁵ Certainly Maximilian's party was far from anxious to increase his difficulties with Washington by too open concessions to the already lost cause.

One might continue indefinitely relating incidents of the blockade and searching on one trail after another for more evidence. The story is still disconnected and far from complete. But whatever may be found, one thing is certain: there will be drama, high adventure, patriotism and its opposite, ambitious speculation, political expediency, and international cross-purposes.

⁴¹ Letter from correspondent in Matamoros, January 25, 1864, in *Washington National Republican*, February 27, 1864.

⁴² *L'Estafette*, March 9, 1865.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, March 18, 1865. See also, *House Exec. Docs.*, 39 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 1, Part 3, pp. 363-64, 371-74.

⁴⁴ Bazaine to Garnier, March 2, 1865, in *Relaciones Exteriores de México*, Legajo 14-3-1, Expediente H/504.2 "854-67" /1; Correspondence with General James E. Slaughter, printed in *Monterey Gazette*, December 18, 1865, *ibid.*, Legajo 27-12-66, Expediente H/252 (44:72) "862" /14.

⁴⁵ *L'Estafette*, April 22, 1864.

The Underwood Presidential Movement of 1912

BY ARTHUR S. LINK

During the presidential campaign of 1912, for the first time since 1860, a Southerner living in the South was an active candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination. He was Oscar Wilder Underwood, born in Louisville, Kentucky, on May 6, 1862. His grandfather, Joseph R. Underwood, had been Henry Clay's Whig colleague from Kentucky in the United States Senate; his father, a distinguished lawyer, was the first attorney for the Louisville and Nashville Railroad. In early childhood Underwood moved with his family to St. Paul, Minnesota, where he lost much of his southern accent and learned something of the spirit of the frontier West. When he was thirteen his family returned to Louisville. At the University of Virginia, Oscar W. Underwood studied law and drank deeply from the wells of Jeffersonian democracy. Thenceforth he thought of himself as a Jeffersonian Democrat.¹

Upon graduation, Underwood turned westward and again went to St. Paul to begin his legal practice. Soon he was drawn by his brother to the rapidly growing town of Birmingham, Alabama. In this iron and steel center of the New South, Underwood built up a prosperous legal practice and married Bertha Woodward, daughter of a pioneer

¹ Research for this article was made possible by a grant-in-aid from the Julius Rosenwald Fund.

There is no full-length biography of Underwood. An appreciative sketch, by Claude G. Bowers, appears as the Foreword of Oscar W. Underwood, *Drifting Sands of Party Politics* (New York, 1931), vii-xxiv. For a contemporary appraisal, see Burton J. Hendrick, "Oscar W. Underwood, a New Leader from the New South," in *McClure's Magazine* (New York, 1893-1929), XXXVIII (1912), 405-20.

iron manufacturer. At thirty he was chairman of the executive committee of his congressional district; at thirty-three he was elected to Congress. He moved slowly forward in the House of Representatives. Beginning his congressional career as an inconspicuous member of the House Committee on Public Lands, Underwood steadily advanced until, in 1909, he was the ranking Democrat on the Ways and Means Committee.

During the congressional session of 1910-1911 insurgent Republicans aided by the Democrats revolted against the dictatorship of Speaker Joseph G. Cannon and deprived him of his plenary powers over the House of Representatives. The power to appoint members of congressional committees was taken from the speaker and vested in the Ways and Means Committee, thus establishing that committee as the dominant body of the House. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee not only exercised decisive influence in framing money bills and in appointing the members to the House committees, but he also became the recognized leader of the House majority.

When President William H. Taft called Congress into special session in the spring of 1911 to ratify his reciprocity agreement with Canada, it was the Democratic House of Representatives elected in the Democratic landslide of November, 1910, that was organized. Underwood advanced to the chairmanship of the Ways and Means Committee and to the position of Democratic leader of the House, and the American people soon began to learn what manner of man was guiding the destinies of the Democratic party in Congress. Of commanding presence, Underwood was strong-framed and sturdily built. His round, clean-shaven face was serene and his blue eyes had a friendly twinkle in them. In 1911 Underwood was only forty-nine. There was little about him that suggested the old-fashioned southern politician. So conventional was his dress that he might have been mistaken for a banker, manufacturer, or prosperous merchant.² His consummate tact, modesty, even temperament, and perfect self-control made him an ideal party leader. His years of assiduous study of tariff legislation and his

² Hendrick, "Oscar W. Underwood," *loc. cit.*, 405.

clarity and conciseness in expressing his tariff opinions marked him as the outstanding Democratic authority on the important question. His associates in Congress knew him as a sound thinker, a student of the intricate facts and figures of tariff legislation, and a friendly compromiser and conciliator.³

In one respect Underwood was an old-fashioned Democrat. He believed firmly in what were then called the fundamentals of Jeffersonian Democracy: tariff legislation for revenue only, opposition to the concentration of government authority, strong local government, and state sovereignty.⁴ He was not a progressive, then, in the conventional sense of the word. He stood, for example, unalterably opposed to the initiative, referendum, and recall.⁵ Though a conservative by conviction, he supported a number of progressive reforms, particularly the reduction of the Republican protective tariff. He was honest and courageous and, as one commentator wrote in 1912, progressives who did not agree with him could at least respect him.⁶

William J. Bryan, thrice leader of the Democrats, immediately challenged the rising leadership of the Alabaman. He regarded Underwood as a reactionary and a pawn of Wall Street.⁷ The personal issue between the two men came to the boiling point during the summer of 1911. Because the Democrats were undertaking a revision of the tariff laws, Bryan hurried to the capital to take a hand in the management of the details of legislation. Rebuffed by the Democrats, who refused to heed his demands for an open party caucus, the Nebraskan withdrew from the scene and waged a campaign of prejudiced criticism against the Democratic leader from the South.

At the beginning of the extra session Underwood told his colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee that he believed the steel and

³ Robert W. Woolley, "Underwood of Alabama, Democracy's New Chieftain," in *Review of Reviews* (New York, 1890-1937), XLIV (1911), 296.

⁴ Bowers' Foreword, in Underwood, *Drifting Sands of Party Politics*, xxi.

⁵ See, for example, Underwood's speech on these reforms, quoted in *La Follette's Magazine* (Madison, 1909-1929), February 3, 1912, p. 4.

⁶ Ray Stannard Baker, "Our Next President and Some Others," in *American Magazine* (New York, 1876-), LXXIV (1912), 134-36.

⁷ *Commoner* (Lincoln, Neb., 1901-1923), November 17, 1911, p. 1.

iron schedules should be the first to undergo revision and that he did not want them to feel any embarrassment because steel-making was the chief industry of his district. The committee, however, thought the woolen, cotton goods, and agricultural implements schedules demanded their immediate attention, and Underwood acquiesced in the opinion of the majority.⁸

Immediately Bryan began a loud demand from Lincoln for a tariff bill embodying a free wool schedule. The bill, as reported by the Ways and Means Committee and unanimously approved by a Democratic caucus, levied a 20 per cent tax on wool. The Nebraskan hastened to attack Underwood. "Many honest men have been misled by Mr. Underwood's specious argument, but The Commoner asks these democrats to watch the chairman of the ways and means committee," Bryan warned.⁹ The Democratic wool bill passed the House despite Bryan's objections and he became more irascible. He recklessly attacked Underwood, charging that he had opposed an immediate effort to revise the iron and steel schedules, and thus had shown favoritism to the steel and iron interests of his own district. Underwood's action, Bryan declared, had revealed him as an opponent of tariff reform. "The unmasking of Chairman Underwood will serve a useful purpose," Bryan added, "if it arouses the democrats to an understanding of the mistake made in putting Mr. Underwood at the head of the committee."¹⁰

On August 2, 1911, Underwood rose in the House of Representatives to defend his personal integrity against Bryan's assaults. For the first time it appeared that the Alabaman lost control of himself. He bitterly excoriated and denounced the Commoner and openly declared that his statements were without any basis of truth. In defense of his attitude on the revision of the iron and steel schedules, Underwood

⁸ Based on Underwood's speech in the House of Representatives on August 2, 1911. The truth of the facts in the case was attested to by the other members of the Ways and Means Committee. *Congressional Record*, 62 Cong., 1 Sess., 3511 (August 2, 1911).

⁹ *Commoner*, June 9, 1911, p. 1.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, August 4, 1911, p. 1. This editorial had been given to the press previous to its publication in the *Commoner*, and appeared in many newspapers on August 2, 1911. See, for example, the *Washington Herald*, August 2, 1911.

called upon his Democratic colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee to corroborate his statement that he had desired to attack first the iron and steel schedules. This they gladly did. Claude Kitchin, a devoted friend of Bryan's, believed that the Commoner had been "misinformed."¹¹ Underwood's arraignment of Bryan aroused the intense enthusiasm of his colleagues in the House. They stood on their chairs and yelled at the tops of their voices when he fired his broadsides. It was a remarkable endorsement of the Alabaman's leadership.¹²

Undoubtedly Bryan realized that he was losing his position as spokesman for and leader of the Democrats, for he fought a lone fight against Underwood. Woodrow Wilson, striving to steer a middle course between conservatism and Bryanism, announced in June, 1911, his approval of the course of the Democratic House.¹³ Practically none of the old Bryan editors rose up in the Commoner's defense. Most of them agreed with one sincere Bryan man who wrote that the Nebraskan had "lost more friends through his attack upon the honesty and sincerity of Representative Underwood than as a result of anything he had said or done in his career."¹⁴ Manifestly, the Commoner was rapidly being relegated to a position of doubtful leadership.¹⁵

Perhaps unwittingly, Underwood, by his controversy with Bryan and because of his successful leadership in tariff reform, was catapulted into the presidential campaign. The Underwood movement began as a very definite "favorite son" movement in Alabama. Tyler Goodwin, chairman of the Democratic executive committee in that state, initiated Underwood's campaign by declaring in July, 1911, his intention to support Underwood for the presidency.¹⁶ Senator John H. Bankhead immediately assumed the leadership of Underwood's campaign and

¹¹ Underwood's speech and the testimony of the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee are printed in *Congressional Record*, 62 Cong., 1 Sess., 3511-13 (August 2, 1911).

¹² Petersburg *Daily Index-Appeal*, August 4, 1911.

¹³ Charleston *News and Courier*, June 6, 1911.

¹⁴ Petersburg *Daily Index-Appeal*, August 4, 1911.

¹⁵ For the first time since Bryan's nomination in 1896 his name was not applauded when it was spoken in a legislative body in Arkansas. Little Rock *Arkansas Democrat*, April 6, 1911.

¹⁶ Montgomery *Advertiser*, July 28, 1911.

after a conference with Alabama Democrats declared that the state would stand by her representative.¹⁷

During the following month, however, when Senator Bankhead endeavored to secure the endorsement of Alabama for her son, he encountered considerable difficulty, for many Alabamans spoke lightly of Underwood's candidacy and praised Woodrow Wilson.¹⁸ Frank P. Glass, editor of the Birmingham *News*, who feared that Underwood's candidacy was being used in Alabama as a front for Judson Harmon, conservative governor of Ohio, forced Bankhead and Underwood to deny that the state's delegation would be turned over to the Ohio governor.¹⁹ But there was no doubt that the rank and file of Alabama Democrats were overwhelmingly disposed to support Underwood's candidacy,²⁰ while Alabama's representatives in Congress gave a ringing notice of their unanimous approval.²¹

The Wilson men in Alabama bowed to the inevitable. One by one the Wilson newspapers²² joined in the hue and cry for Underwood. In January, 1912, a number of prominent Wilson Democrats conferred at Montgomery and agreed that there should be no campaign for Wilson in Underwood's state. Wilson supporters in Alabama should attempt, rather, to secure second-choice representation for their candidate.²³ Consequently Alabama experienced no pre-convention presidential campaign. At a Democratic presidential primary in April, 1912, one hundred thousand Alabama Democrats gave their unanimous endorsement to Underwood, while the state Democratic convention instructed its delegation to vote "first, last, and all the time" for Alabama's favorite son.²⁴

National Underwood headquarters were established in Washington

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, October 1, 1911.

¹⁸ *Atlanta Georgian*, November 14, 1911, quoting *Birmingham News*; *Atlanta Journal*, March 29, 1912, quoting *Huntsville (Ala.) Times*.

¹⁹ *Pensacola Journal*, March 10, 1912; *Mobile Register*, November 25, 1911.

²⁰ *Birmingham Age-Herald*, December 21, 1911.

²¹ *Mobile Register*, December 8, 1911.

²² The most prominent of these were: *Birmingham News*, *Birmingham Age-Herald*, *Mobile Register*, *Montgomery Times*.

²³ *Charlotte Daily Observer*, March 11, 1912, quoting *Birmingham News*.

²⁴ *Montgomery Advertiser*, April 2, 18, 1912; *Birmingham Age-Herald*, April 20, 1912.

in February, 1912. Bankhead installed Thomas M. Owen of Montgomery in charge at Washington and designated him as the publicity director of the headquarters.²⁵ The Underwood campaign committee played shrewd politics. Inasmuch as the straightforward Underwood appeal of tariff reform would make a deep impression upon southern farmers who thought they were the chief victims of the Republican protective tariff, the Underwood campaign committee prepared a four-page supplement for distribution by southern newspapers. This supplement, containing a brief history of Underwood's career and voluminous endorsements of him by newspapers and politicians, was spread, especially by the country newspapers, throughout the Southeast. It was a capital stroke, for thousands of southern farmers who got most of their information from their county newspapers were told for the first time of what Underwood was attempting to do, and what he would do for them if elected president.

The publication and distribution of the supplement entailed some expenditures by the Underwood managers.²⁶ The report given out by the Wilson headquarters at Washington that Thomas Fortune Ryan, notorious Wall Street financier, was financing the Underwood campaign evoked a spirited, if evasive, denial from Bankhead, who declared that the campaign was being financed entirely by contributions from Underwood clubs in Alabama.²⁷ The Underwood manager, months later, admitted before a Senate investigating committee that the New York financier had contributed \$35,000 to the Underwood coffers.²⁸

²⁵ Birmingham *Age-Herald*, February 20, 1912.

²⁶ Newspapers which circulated the Underwood supplement were given financial compensation by the campaign committee at the following rate: \$10.00 to newspapers whose circulation did not exceed 1,000; \$12.50 to papers with a circulation of from 1,000 to 1,500; \$15.00 to papers with a circulation of 2,000 and upward. "The use of the supplement would not be intended to in any way commit you to Mr. Underwood's claim for the nomination. The whole transaction is purely a business one, and is allowable in every way, by the ethics of good journalism," Bankhead wrote. John H. Bankhead to southern weekly newspaper editors, published in *Nashville Tennessean and American*, February 9, 1912. The letter was sent to over one thousand editors.

²⁷ Birmingham *Age-Herald*, February 12, 1912.

²⁸ Testimony of John H. Bankhead before the Clapp Senatorial Committee, in United States Senate, *Campaign Contributions: Testimony before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, United States Senate, Sixty-Second Congress, Second Session* (Washington, 1912), 938. In all, the Underwood managers expended \$52,000.

The Underwood movement gained tremendous momentum in the first half of 1912 and swept through the Southeast. Alabama, Georgia, Florida, and Mississippi were captured by enthusiastic Underwood campaigners, while inroads were made in Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee. Underwood leaders realized, however, that even should their candidate sweep the entire South into his ranks his nomination would still be far from probable. What was needed was the support of some powerful northern delegation at the Baltimore convention. This, unfortunately for his candidacy, Underwood never received. Many northern newspapers praised his leadership of the party and commended his candidacy, but none advocated his nomination.²⁹

The appeal of the Underwood leaders to the southern people was made fundamentally upon the issues of sectional pride and tariff reform. The appeal to sectional loyalty was so greatly emphasized that at times it obscured the real issues of the campaign. It was taken for granted that Underwood was southern until a journalist, writing in an influential magazine, stated that the Alabaman had barely escaped being both a Northerner and a tariff protectionist.³⁰ Underwood countered with the statement that his father had been imprisoned by Federal authorities during the Civil War because of his sympathy for the southern cause and that three uncles had fought in the Confederate army.³¹

The Underwood press in the South reiterated again and again that the sacred honor of the region was involved in the Alabaman's candidacy. The North was ready to accept Underwood, these editors

²⁹ See editorials in *New York World*, August 6, 1911; *Cincinnati Enquirer*, October 23, 1911; *New York American*, September 25, 1911; *Albany (N. Y.) Argus*, November 23, 1911; *New York Times*, November 26, 1911; *Chicago Inter-Ocean*, September 26, 1911; *New York Evening Post*, August 2, 1911; *Atlanta Constitution*, April 4, 1911, quoting *New York Herald*; *ibid.*, May 28, 1912, quoting *Washington Times*; *Mobile Register*, August 7, 1911, quoting *Brooklyn Eagle*; *Jacksonville Florida Times-Union*, February 28 and 29, 1912, quoting *New York Sun*; *ibid.*, March 4, 1912, quoting *Providence Journal*, *Butte (Mont.) Miner*, and *New York Evening Post*; *ibid.*, March 7, 1912, quoting *St. Louis Republic*; *ibid.*, March 19, 1912, quoting *Jersey City Jersey Journal*; *ibid.*, March 23, 1912, quoting *Springfield Republican*; *ibid.*, April 11, 1912, quoting *Chicago Journal*; *Birmingham Age-Herald*, July 28, 1911, quoting *Baltimore Sun*.

³⁰ Hendrick, "Oscar W. Underwood," *loc. cit.*, 405.

³¹ *Atlanta Constitution*, March 24, 1912.

declared, if the South would rally to his support. For half a century Southerners had constituted the backbone of the Democratic party, had "hewn the wood and drawn the water," and eaten "the husks that fell from the table." "The South for a Southerner" became the Underwood battle cry. Should Southerners refuse to support a Southerner, Underwood journals insisted, they would bequeath to their children the birthright of "perpetual serfdom" and deny to them the privilege of national political equality which would be their lot should Underwood become president.³² Southerners could, by voting for Underwood, break the unwritten law which decreed that no Southerner should aspire to the presidency; they could substitute political manhood for misgiving and timidity; they could tear loose political shackles that "scorched and festered."³³ In other words, Southerners should "Vote for the South!"³⁴

The "southern" issue was a two-edged sword which might be used against the South by northern Republicans; but Underwood supporters were on surer ground when they advocated his nomination because of his constructive statesmanship. In fact, Underwood's pre-eminent leadership in tariff reform constituted his strongest claim upon the Democratic masses. "Tariff for revenue only" had been the traditional battle cry of the southern Democratic party for many decades, and southern agrarians in 1912 were convinced that the discriminatory protective tariff policy of the Republican party was the chief cause of their economic difficulties. It was therefore natural that thousands of southern Democrats should regard tariff reform as the most important issue of the campaign and that they should look askance at Woodrow

³² *Ibid.*, May 1, 1912.

³³ *Ibid.*, May 12, 1912.

³⁴ On this theme, see also editorials in Memphis *Commercial Appeal*, April 18, 1912; *ibid.*, March 14, 1912, quoting Columbus (Ga.) *Ledger*; *ibid.*, March 17, 1912, quoting Savannah *Morning News*; Jacksonville *Florida Times-Union*, February 16, April 30, 1912; *ibid.*, February 3, 1912, quoting Gainesville (Fla.) *Sun*; *ibid.*, March 1, 1912, quoting Live Oak (Fla.) *Democrat*; *ibid.*, March 15, 1912, quoting Suwanee (Fla.) *Democrat*; Montgomery *Advertiser*, January 1, 1912, quoting Shreveport *Times*; *ibid.*, April 15, 1912, quoting Macon *Telegraph*; Mobile *Register*, January 2, 1912; Birmingham *Age-Herald*, February 3, May 1, 1912; Charlotte *Daily Observer*, April 19, 1912, quoting Thomasville (N. C.) *Davidsonian*.

Wilson's statements that the details of tariff legislation were relatively unimportant.

When President Taft vetoed the tariff bills enacted by Congress in 1911 many Southerners were confident that he had set the stage for the coming political battle. The Democratic party, these Southerners declared, was unfaithful to true Democratic principles when it went the way of the Great Commoner. Since tariff reform was the only issue upon which the Democratic party had ever achieved success, since it constituted the outstanding issue of the 1912 campaign, was it not logical that Oscar W. Underwood should lead the Democratic hosts? His enemies could not deny, Underwood supporters asserted, that he was the greatest Democratic exponent of tariff reform and that his consummate and masterful leadership had been an important factor in writing the very issue of the campaign. The party could not afford to forfeit its only claim to existence, Underwood men declared; Democrats must not leave their ancient moorings again to follow another Bryan.³⁵

At the same time, Thomas E. Watson, whom few would have classified as a conservative in 1912, aroused many southern farmers to the support of Underwood by his constant praise of the Alabaman. The following editorial is typical of his appeal:

For 30 years, I have dreamed of a union of the South and West, against the Money Power of the East and North. . . .

At this time, I again see a chance to weld together the agricultural sections, both of which are bled white by tariff taxation. And, again, it is Bryan who is balking the strategy.

Oscar Underwood succeeded in passing through Congress a bill which virtually carried into effect the demand which the Farmer's Alliance put into the Ocala platform of 1891. HIS FARMERS' FREE-LIST BILL PROPOSED TO REMOVE THE TARIFF-TAX, FROM THE ARTICLES "WHICH THE POOR MUST HAVE TO LIVE."

³⁵ Some of the more significant editorials concerning Underwood and his achievements in tariff reform are found in the following: Jacksonville *Florida Times-Union*, July 29, 1911, January 25, February 2, 1912; Mobile *Register*, June 11, November 30, December 24, 1911; Norfolk *Virginian-Pilot*, May 26, 1912; Charlotte *Daily Observer*, February 9, 1912; Atlanta *Constitution*, February 6, March 14 and 30, 1912; Birmingham *Age-Herald*, July 17, October 28, December 17, 1911; Charleston *News and Courier*, January 30, 1912; Vicksburg *Herald*, February 25, April 25, 1912; Montgomery *Advertiser*, April 5, 1912.

Underwood's bill was the most sweeping measure of free trade, that Congress has passed since John C. Calhoun won his magnificent battle over Daniel Webster, Henry Clay and Andrew Jackson.³⁶

Underwood's skill in uniting the divergent elements of the party in Congress into a solid, working group undisturbed by party rebellion and antagonisms was a fundamental reason for the success of the Democratic House in 1911 and 1912. He had demonstrated that he could lead. Manifestly, here was a reasonable argument for his nomination. He had proved that Democrats did not have to gratify their Republican opponents by "doing the wrong thing at the right time." Underwood's leadership was desperately needed, his advocates insisted, to weld the discordant elements of the party into a harmoniously functioning organism.³⁷

The Underwood campaign, generally speaking, united conservative southern Democrats into a counter-movement against the flood-tide of Wilsonian progressivism which was sweeping the South. The truth of this generalization is revealed by the nature of the support the Alabaman received. In every state in which the contest was fought between Underwood and Wilson men, the conservative state organization was the body and substance of the Underwood movement. In Virginia the Martin-Swanson organization, in North Carolina the Simmons organization,³⁸ in Georgia the Joseph M. Brown-Clark Howell-Tom Watson coalition, and in Florida the conservative faction led by Governor Albert W. Gilchrist and the Jacksonville *Florida Times-Union* were arrayed in the vanguard of the movement to make Underwood president. The same general conservatism was apparent in Underwood's newspaper support, for the pre-eminent conservative journals of the Southeast—the Charlotte *Daily Observer*, the Atlanta *Constitution*, the Augusta *Chronicle*, the Savannah *Morning News*, the Macon *Telegraph*, the Montgomery *Advertiser*, the Vicksburg *Herald*, and the Memphis

³⁶ *Jeffersonian* (Thomson, Ga.), February 8, 1912.

³⁷ Jacksonville *Florida Times-Union*, February 10, 1912; *ibid.*, March 21, 1912, quoting *Raleigh Times*; *ibid.*, April 4, 1912, quoting *Birmingham News*; Pensacola *Evening News*, April 5, 1912; *Birmingham Age-Herald*, March 19, 1912, quoting *Columbus Enquirer-Sun*; Charlotte *Daily Observer*, May 16, 1912, quoting *Danville (Va.) Register*.

³⁸ Senator Furnifold M. Simmons, however, did not take an active part in the campaign.

Commercial Appeal—were the spokesmen for the Underwood cause. Moreover, this identical conservative faction quite naturally was in opposition to William J. Bryan and his brand of progressive Democracy. It was not uncommon in the South, therefore, to read that Underwood was the "safe and sane candidate," that he stood in opposition to destructive Socialism, that he was the man destined to safeguard American institutions from the violent ravages of the mob.³⁹

On the other hand, there were numerous Southerners—largely in the Wilson ranks—who, despite their high regard for Underwood's personal character and for his services to party and to country, honestly believed that he had no possible chance to win the nomination. His record had been one of clear, sane, constructive legislation, they said, but he had had no executive experience. He was a fearless leader, but he had neither prestige nor popularity with the mass of the American people, both of which were prerequisites of national leadership. The appeal to the South's pride and "manhood," the battle cry, "The South for a Southerner," were not only meaningless sentimentality, thought these Southerners, they were pernicious slogans which would result only in magnifying sectional antagonisms.

Why then did not the entire South immediately rally in support of Underwood? The reasons, of course, were complex, but perhaps the most important factor was the understanding by scores of influential party leaders of the realistic fact that the South alone could not nominate the presidential candidate. These leaders were extremely reluctant, moreover, to test public opinion on the sectional issue which might be used by the Republicans to fan into a burning fire the prejudice which had so long constituted an unwritten ban on the Democratic party. Even the most irrational Underwood advocates could not escape the inevitable conclusion that their candidate was, politically speaking, unavailable. There was little probability that he could, in a straightforward Republican and Democratic campaign, carry a single state outside the South. A conservative, he would encounter the opposition

³⁹ Jacksonville *Florida Times-Union*, April 4, 1912, quoting *Birmingham News*; Charlotte *Daily Observer*, November 26, 1911; Atlanta *Constitution*, March 14, 1912, quoting *Savannah Morning News*.

of northern independents and western insurgents. It was also conceded that Bryan would not support him. But the most irrevocable conclusion undermining the strength of the Underwood movement was the inescapable fact that he was from a solidly Democratic state within the Solid South and was therefore "unavailable" as a presidential candidate.⁴⁰

Wilson leaders suspected, also, that Underwood's candidacy was insincere, and that it was an underhand trick to draw away from Wilson the support he would likely have received in the Lower South. Since the Underwood movement was essentially a southern conservative cause, many Wilson advocates predicted that the Underwood delegations would be delivered to Harmon or some other northern conservative at the Democratic national convention at Baltimore. After thirty years, the doubts of the sincerity of the Underwood movement still rise to plague us. There can be little doubt, however, that Underwood's managers entered the presidential adventure firmly convinced that their candidate had a good chance to win the nomination. They fought, therefore, not for Harmon nor for any candidate except their own. The Democratic outlook, furthermore, appeared to favor Underwood's candidacy. To all appearances the rising tides of the Champ Clark and Wilson movements might, when they clashed in the convention, neutralize the strength of each other. Under such circumstances, a deadlock would create an impasse in which it would be impossible for either

⁴⁰ For a general discussion of the factors operating against the Underwood movement see: *Mobile Register*, August 6, 1911, quoting *Birmingham News*; *Atlanta Journal*, March 28, 1912, quoting *Tampa Tribune*; *Richmond Virginian*, April 5, 1912; *Nashville Banner*, October 26, November 27, 1911; *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, June 12, 1912; *Raleigh News and Observer*, May 26, 1912, quoting *Monroe Carolina Democrat*; *Norfolk Virginian-Pilot*, October 28, 1911, March 5, 1912; *Dallas Morning News*, March 4, 1912; *Pensacola Journal*, October 29, 1911.

Bryan's attitude toward Underwood's candidacy had been indicated in a statement in his *Commoner* that "The Harmon strength shows signs of shifting to Congressman Underwood. This was to be expected. The Wall street crowd does not lack intelligence and it would be very dull if it did not see in Mr. Underwood a more efficient representative than Governor Harmon could possibly be. . . . If Mr. Underwood is nominated it will increase his prestige and he will be in a position to lead the reactionary element of the party against progressive measures. . . . Mr. Underwood has youth, ability and courage—just the combination that Wall street needs. Watch him grow—in the subsidized press of both parties." *Commoner*, November 17, 1911, p. 1.

Clark or Wilson to secure the nomination. They believed, therefore, that the swing of several powerful northern delegations to Underwood at the propitious moment could easily result in an irresistible landslide to their candidate. Thus with a solid block of southern votes, Underwood possibly might, as the compromise candidate, win the nomination.

The Underwood forces went to the Baltimore convention with instructed delegations from Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and Mississippi—a total of eight-four votes; and these four delegations remained faithful to him throughout the forty-five ballots which had to be taken before the deadlock between Clark and Wilson was broken. His name was placed before the convention by William B. Bankhead of Alabama, a son of the Senator, and on the first ballot he received 117½ votes, including fourteen from Virginia and scattered support from members of the North Carolina and Tennessee delegations. Ahead of him were Clark, with 440½ votes, Wilson, with 324, and Harmon, with 148, all of them, of course, far short of the two-thirds majority necessary for nomination. As the balloting proceeded, Underwood received a few occasional votes from Connecticut, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, and Michigan, and on the nineteenth ballot his highest total of 130 votes was reached. At no time was there a serious possibility of his being accepted as a compromise candidate, and as the tide slowly turned toward Wilson after the tenth ballot, when Clark received the support of the Tammany-controlled 90 votes from New York, some of the Underwood delegates began to urge that they be released from their pledge to support the Alabaman. Senator Bankhead held on stubbornly, however, until the forty-fifth ballot showed that his support had dropped to 97 votes; and when he withdrew his candidate's name at the beginning of the next roll-call, the Underwood delegates immediately joined in the landslide which gave Wilson the nomination.⁴¹

Although there was never any considerable chance that Underwood would receive the nomination, his delegates nevertheless played a significant role in the convention. By refusing to go over to Clark on

⁴¹ *Official Report of the Proceedings of the Democratic National Convention, Held in Baltimore, June 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29, and July 1 and 2, 1912* (Chicago, 1912), *passim*.

the tenth ballot, for example, when the Missourian received 556 votes—a majority of the convention vote—the Underwood men co-operated with the Wilson managers in creating a solid block of more than one-third of the convention votes and successfully prevented a Clark landslide. The formation of the Wilson-Underwood alliance was the result of skillful bargaining on the part of Wilson's managers, who saw early in the convention that the Underwood managers held the balance of power at Baltimore. Thomas W. Gregory, William F. McCombs, and other Wilson leaders conferred with the Underwood managers before the tenth ballot and both groups agreed that the Underwood delegates should stand by their candidate during the threatened Clark landslide; and, in return, the Wilson managers agreed to throw the weight of their influence to the Underwood candidacy if "Wilson should be put out of the race at any stage of the game."⁴² Thus, a vote for Underwood during the crucial tenth, eleventh, and twelfth ballots was as good as a vote for Wilson.⁴³

During the course of the voting in the convention from the tenth to the forty-fifth ballots, Wilson steadily gained strength. His greatest gain came on the forty-third ballot, when Illinois, Virginia, and West Virginia went over solidly to him and boosted his total vote to over 600. The forty-fifth ballot marked the major crisis for Woodrow Wilson at Baltimore, for despite his considerable gains the New Jersey governor was still 97 votes short of a two-thirds majority. There were rumors that Roger Sullivan, Illinois Democratic boss, would take his delegation back to Clark on the forty-sixth ballot, and the Wilson managers were convinced that if their candidate could not secure the support of the Underwood delegations, he would surely be defeated. After hurried

⁴² Thomas W. Gregory to Edward M. House, July 9, 1912, in Edward M. House Papers (Library of Yale University).

⁴³ It is interesting to speculate why the Underwood managers, who had the power to decide the contest in Clark's favor, refused to effect the Missourian's nomination. The vice-presidency must certainly have been offered to them by the Clark managers; but Underwood and Bankhead were not at all interested in the vice-presidency (Underwood refused to accept the nomination when Wilson later offered it to him). They were after nothing less than the presidential nomination. The truth of the matter was that Wilson really was the second choice of a good majority of the Underwood delegates, most of whom disliked Clark intensely.

conferences between the Wilson and Underwood managers, the Alabama men immediately decided to withdraw Underwood's name. This, they believed, would break the convention deadlock and result in Wilson's nomination.⁴⁴ On the forty-sixth ballot, consequently, when Senator Bankhead withdrew Underwood's name, there was a wild scramble of delegates to the Wilson standard and the Governor was immediately nominated.

When the Underwood movement is considered in the setting of the conflict between conservative and progressive forces within the Democratic party in 1912, it can hardly be said to have had any great significance in itself. If it was intended as a conservative movement, it lost its sense of direction in the swing to Wilson; if, on the other hand, it was designed primarily to break down the barrier against southern aspirants for the presidency, as Senator Bankhead claimed in withdrawing Underwood's name, it had merely emphasized the fact that under existing circumstances in the Democratic party a Southerner was still not to be considered as an available candidate. It began, in the last analysis, as a "favorite son" movement in Alabama and developed subsequently into a regional "favorite son" campaign; but it also heralded the approach of the day when Southerners were to dominate the national government during the Wilson administration. Although the movement failed in its immediate objective—the presidential nomination—it played a role of tremendous importance at Baltimore. It is perhaps a bit ironic that the Underwood campaigners who, along with Champ Clark, provided the only real opposition to Wilson in the South during the pre-convention campaign should have become one of the few really important forces that secured his nomination at Baltimore in July, 1912.

⁴⁴ This story is told in interesting detail in the Birmingham *Age-Herald*, July 4, 5, 7, 1912.

Notes and Documents

A LETTER OF MARQUE ISSUED BY WILLIAM AUGUSTUS BOWLES
AS DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE STATE OF MUSKOGEE

EDITED BY DUVON C. CORBITT AND JOHN TATE LANNING

Of all the adventurers, knaves, and heroes who paraded through the Old Southwest during the last quarter of the eighteenth century, none was more colorful than William Augustus Bowles. Before he was twenty he had been court-martialed, deprived of a commission in the British army, and received as a brother among the Creeks. Among the Indians he achieved sufficient influence to keep the Spanish-American frontier in turmoil for a generation. The confusion produced along this border by international rivalries, the conflict of the Indians with their neighbors, and the contests of rival trading companies, created an atmosphere admirably suited to his machinating talents. After establishing contact with Lord Dunmore, governor of the Bahamas, and with merchants who eyed with envy the trade monopoly enjoyed by Panton, Leslie and Company, Bowles undermined the influence of Alexander McGillivray and organized an Indian state under British protection. To achieve this purpose he led three expeditions into Florida. Since his plans were dangerous to Spain and the United States as well as to the powerful trading firm headed by William Panton, the task he undertook was by no means easy.

Between expeditions Bowles visited Canada, Jamaica, England, and the Bahamas at the expense of the British government and traveled around the world at the expense of the Spanish government (as a prisoner), whose problem he had become. Spain vacillated between

executing him and giving him a major general's commission. Britain was never sure how much to offer him. The United States stood ready for anything short of murder to remove this trouble-maker from its southern frontier.

Born in Frederick County, Maryland, on November 2, 1763,¹ Bowles ran away from home at the age of thirteen and made his way to Philadelphia, where he enlisted as a "volunteer" in an old British regiment of the line. Two years later he was commissioned as ensign in the Maryland Loyalist Corps, then being organized by Lieutenant Colonel James Chalmers, and served with it during the retreat from Philadelphia to New York in 1778.² Toward the end of that year the corps was sent to Pensacola to reinforce West Florida against the attack expected to follow the impending break with Spain.³ Before that break came, however, the young ensign had been court-martialed and dismissed from the service. His eulogists make out a good case for him, but his later career suggests insubordination. Whatever his conduct, his dismissal led to his introduction to the Indian country and to his life's work. At the invitation of some Creeks visiting Pensacola, Bowles accompanied them to their villages. There he was initiated into their

¹ His father, Thomas Bowles, was a farmer of some consequence in Frederick County and was for ten years a deputy commissioner of the county and a vestryman of All Saints' Parish. Of his mother little is known beyond the fact that her name was Eleanor. The father at first shared the opposition to English colonial policy, and as late as January, 1775, was a member of the Frederick County committee of correspondence, but at the outbreak of hostilities he refused to follow the patriotic cause. Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone (eds.), *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), II, 519-20; John Thomas Scharf, *History of Western Maryland*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1882), I, 126-28, 480-95; *Correspondence of Governor Horatio Sharpe*, Vol. III, 1761-1771, in *Archives of Maryland* (Baltimore, 1883-), XIV (1895), 502. See also the autobiographical sketch made by William A. Bowles for Estevan Miró, enclosed in Miró to Conde de Aranda, May 26, 1792, in Archivo General de Simancas, Sección de Guerra, Legajo 6916 (Photostat held by the North Carolina Historical Commission, translation in Webb Memorial Library, St. Augustine).

² *Public Characters, or Contemporary Biography* (Baltimore, 1803), 332-39; *The Authentic Memoirs of William Augustus Bowles* (London, 1792, reprint Tarrytown, N. Y., 1916); Wilbur H. Siebert, *The Loyalists of Pennsylvania* (Columbus, 1913), 12-13.

³ Siebert, *Loyalists of Pennsylvania*, 12-14; Bernardo de Gálvez to Martín Navarro, February 5, 1799, in Archivo Nacional de Cuba, Floridas, Legajo 15, No. 77.

customs and in due time married the daughter of Chief Perryman in authentic Indian style.⁴

When hostilities began between Great Britain and Spain, Governor Bernardo de Gálvez of Louisiana, during 1779 and 1780, took the posts along the Mississippi and the port of Mobile. By 1781 he was ready for an attack on Pensacola. General John Campbell, the British commander in West Florida, thereupon called on the Indians for aid. The Creek warriors, who responded with alacrity, were accompanied by Bowles who served as an Indian during the campaign that ended with the surrender of Pensacola. His conduct during the siege was so striking that General Campbell invited him to join his corps permanently. The young ensign accepted the invitation and accompanied the retiring troops to New York, where he remained until the end of the Revolution.⁵

Bowles left the army in 1783 and drifted back to the Creek country, arriving there in May, 1785.⁶ Some twelve months later he visited the Bahamas, where he made the acquaintance of John Miller of the firm of Miller, Bonnamy and Company, merchants, and through him met Lord Dunmore, the governor of the islands. Miller was interested in making reprisals against the Spaniards for damages inflicted on his property during the Revolution by Spanish troops who had invaded the Bahamas. He was even more interested in obtaining the trade of the Southern Indians. Dunmore, an old intriguer in Indian affairs, hoped to redeem for England some of what she had lost in the recent war. A plan was finally worked out by Bowles, Dunmore, and Miller

⁴ *Public Characters, or Contemporary Biography*, 332-39; Carolyn T. Foreman, *Indians Abroad, 1493-1938* (Norman, 1942), 119. See also, Autobiographical sketch for Miró, *loc. cit.*

⁵ John W. Caughey, *Bernardo de Gálvez in Louisiana* (Berkeley, 1934), 194-95; *Report on the American Manuscripts in the Royal Institution of Great Britain*, 4 vols. (London, 1904-1909), II, 209-34; Wilbur H. Siebert, *Legacy of the American Revolution in the West Indies and the Bahamas* (Columbus, 1913).

⁶ Representation of William Augustus Bowles in behalf of himself and five deputies from the United Creeks and Cherokees to his Britannic Majesty, London, January 3, 1791, printed in Frederick J. Turner (ed.), "English Policy toward America in 1790-1791," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), VII (1901-1902), 726-28; Autobiographical sketch for Miró; *Public Characters, or Contemporary Biography*, 337-39.

that called for the establishment of an independent Indian state under British protection. Miller's firm would play a role similar to that of the East India Company, with Bowles as Lord Clive.⁷

Standing in the way of such a program were Spain, the United States, and Panton, Leslie and Company. This trading firm, organized in East Florida during the Revolution, was allowed to remain in the province when the Spaniards returned to control at the end of the war and became the cornerstone of the Spanish Indian policy in the area. By 1788 it had a monopoly of the Indian trade in all Spanish territory east of the Mississippi. An important factor in the development of the firm was its alliance with Alexander McGillivray of the Creeks. This chief had taken advantage of Spanish promises of support. In 1786 he sent his warriors to drive the Georgians off disputed lands along the Oconee River. When the Georgians retaliated, he called on Governor Estevan Miró of New Orleans to supply him with munitions. The governor reluctantly complied. In October, 1787, orders from Spain stopped him. At this stage Bowles and his associates in Nassau came forward with an offer of supplies, which McGillivray gladly accepted.⁸

During the first two or three gun-running expeditions Bowles and his supporters seemed bent on reaping some of the rewards that had been going to Panton, Leslie and Company, but soon the situation began to promise bigger things. It appears that Panton as well as McGillivray had been approached on the possibility of opening a port on the Atlantic under the control of a newly-organized Indian state. Just how far Panton went in the conspiracy is not clear, but there are indications that he toyed with the idea for a time. Soon, however, he

⁷ Autobiographical sketch for Miró; Bowles to Lord Grenville, June 5, 1798, Spanish translation in Archivo Nacional de Cuba, Floridas, Legajo 5, No. 1. See also, Bowles to Grenville, January 13 and 25, 1791, in Turner (ed.), "English Policy toward America," *loc. cit.*, 728-33.

⁸ Documents concerned with the activities of Panton, Leslie and Company and with the Creek war are found in John W. Caughey, *McGillivray of the Creeks* (Norman, 1938); in *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (Savannah, 1917-), XX (1936) to XXV (1941); and in *East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications* (Knoxville, 1929-), IX (1937) to XVI (1944). See also, Arthur P. Whitaker, *The Spanish-American Frontier, 1783-1795* (Boston, 1927), and Duvon C. Corbitt, "Panton, Leslie and Company," in James Truslow Adams (ed.), *Dictionary of American History*, 5 vols. (New York, 1940), IV, 211.

came to fear that he would be a victim of the scheme and rallied to the aid of Spain in blocking the machinations of Bowles, Dunmore, and Miller. McGillivray held out longer, and it was with difficulty that Panton and the Spanish officials persuaded him to act energetically against his old associate, Bowles.⁹

In 1788 Bowles and his supporters turned from munitions-hauling to an open attack on Spain and Panton. Two shiploads of men and supplies were landed at Indian River. Bowles then led his men toward Panton's store on the St. Johns. On hearing that a force of Spanish troops awaited him there, he turned northwestward toward St. Marks. The expected support of the Florida Indians did not materialize and he and the "army" were soon on the scantiest of rations; whereupon Bowles' followers deserted and surrendered to the Spaniards.¹⁰ He and a faithful few made their way to the Apalachicola to await reinforcements sent out by Miller, Bonnamy and Company. Panton and the Spanish authorities demanded that McGillivray either arrest or kill the interloper, but the wily chief refused to destroy the man until the goods from the expected vessel were safely stored in the Creek nation. After that, the most he would promise was the banishment of Bowles from his territory.¹¹ This, however, was not easy, for Bowles now had influence among the Lower Towns where they longed for another season of the plentiful British supplies which they had enjoyed during the Revolution. Furthermore, the ever-resilient Bowles was using this influence to remove McGillivray and place himself at the head of an

⁹ In addition to the works cited in Note 8, see especially Bowles to Grenville, June 5, 1798, cited in Note 7; Bowles to Grenville, January 13, 1791, in Turner (ed.), "English Policy toward America," *loc. cit.*, 728-33; Arturo O'Neill to Miró, July 28, 1788, in *East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications*, XV (1943), 95-98; Alexander McGillivray to O'Neill, June 22, 1788, in Caughey, *McGillivray of the Creeks*, 185-86; McGillivray to Robert Leslie, November 20, 1788, *ibid.*, 205-208.

¹⁰ Substance of a voluntary declaration made by Sundry of Bowles' Banditti at St. Augustine, November 21, 1788, in Archivo Nacional de Cuba, Floridas, Legajo 1, No. 25. See also Lawrence Kinnaird, "International Rivalry in the Creek Country," in *Florida Historical Quarterly* (Jacksonville, 1908-), X (1931-1932), 67.

¹¹ See the documents in Caughey, *McGillivray of the Creeks*, 185-226, especially McGillivray to Leslie, November 20, 1788. Other documents are in *East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications*, XV (1943), 95-101.

Indian confederacy under British protection. He remained in the Creek country until April, 1789, when he left for Canada by way of the Bahamas, taking with him five Indians who professed to represent the "United Nation of Creeks and Cherokees."¹²

In Canada Bowles persuaded the governor, Lord Dorchester, to send him to England where he and his party arrived on October 28, 1790. The Nootka Sound crisis had just been patched up, but the public mind was still inflamed over the possibility of war with Spain. Bowles, in consequence, was looked upon as a hero because of his recent extra-official invasion of Florida. The press commented hopefully on his possible usefulness in case of war. The ministry was willing to use the "ambassadors of the United Nation of Creeks and Cherokees" to impress upon the Spanish government the danger of an Indian attack in Florida and Louisiana should war with Britain be provoked.¹³ This strange party received considerable attention, both public and private, and was sent back to the Bahamas with presents and the promise of what Lord Grenville described as a permit for "intercourse with the British Dominions by an admission to the free ports in His Majesty's West Indian Islands, supposing they should find themselves in a situation to avail themselves of this indulgence."¹⁴

With official blessing, and possibly with more encouragement by word of mouth, Bowles and his Indian friends left England in April, 1791. Before sailing, this bold adventurer addressed himself directly to the king of Spain in a letter of March 25, 1791. He set forth the claims of the Indians to complete sovereignty over their lands and announced the intention of the United Nation of Creeks and Cherokees "to have the free navigation of the *Sea on their Coasts*, and . . . to establish two Ports, one at the *mouth of the Apalachicola River*, and the other on the *Florida Cape*." The advantages to Spain of remaining on good terms with this nation were emphasized, but Bowles declared

¹² Representation of William Augustus Bowles. . . . (see Note 6); William Panton to Miró, October 8, 1791, in Caughey, *McGillivray of the Creeks*, 295-97.

¹³ *Public Characters, or Contemporary Biography*, 340-50; Foreman, *Indians Abroad*, 102-104.

¹⁴ Quoted in Turner (ed.), "English Policy toward America," *loc. cit.*, 708.

"frankly, that if Your Majesty does not grant the free concession, my Nation will immediately make war on Your Majesty to obtain it."¹⁵

The king replied to this ultimatum with an order to colonial officials to intercept the imposter if he tried to reach Florida. Bowles did not heed this threat. Instead, he left Nassau again in a ship fitted out by Miller, Bonnamy and Company, and supplied in part by government stores furnished by Lord Dunmore. He landed in the vicinity of St. Marks and established a camp near the mouth of the Ocklockonee to await the supplies which he promised the Lower Creeks would soon follow. The commander of the Spanish fort at St. Marks was afraid to move against him for fear of a large-scale Indian attack on his post, garrisoned by fewer than one hundred men. The expected boats from the Bahamas delayed their coming. Bowles then persuaded his followers to "borrow" the stock in Panton's store on the Wakulla River about four miles above the fort.¹⁶ This was to cause repercussions in American history for years to come, since it furnished the first of the claims against the Indians which were to lead to the famous land cession known as the Forbes Purchase.¹⁷

Panton and the Spanish authorities in Pensacola demanded again that McGillivray catch or kill the intruder. The chief, who was a sick man at that time, still delayed the issue by blaming the Spaniards for not intercepting the expedition with naval vessels. Finally he did send his brother-in-law, the Frenchman Louis LeClerc Milfort, with some two hundred Indians and promised to go himself if necessary. Panton did not hesitate. On the contrary he promised a half-breed, who had a "good gun and a steady hand," that he should "never be poor again as long as he lived," if "he would rid me of that scoundrel."¹⁸

¹⁵A translation of Bowles' memorial to the king of Spain is in *Archivo Nacional de Cuba, Floridas, Legajo 5, No. 1.*

¹⁶*East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications*, XV (1943), 95-101; Caughey, *McGillivray of the Creeks*, 295-314; Mark F. Boyd, "The Fortifications at San Marcos de Apalache," in *Florida Historical Quarterly*, XV (1936-1937), 3-34; Robert Leslie to Panton, March 10, 1792, in *Georgia Historical Quarterly*, XXII (1938), 186-89. Unprinted material is in *Archivo Nacional de Cuba, Floridas, Legajo 5, No. 1.*

¹⁷An excellent account of this purchase is found in Robert S. Cotterill, "A Chapter of Panton, Leslie and Company," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), X (1944), 275-92.

¹⁸Panton to Leslie, March 4, 1792, in *Archivo General de Indias, Papeles de Cuba,*

It was the unexpected that was Bowles' undoing. He had made an overture to the governor of Louisiana to negotiate for recognition of the independence of his Indian state. Governor Carondelet sent two officers to the camp on the Ocklockonee to suggest that the negotiations be carried on in New Orleans, promising safe conduct to and from that point. Bowles arrived in New Orleans on March 12, 1792, and was treated with deference by Carondelet, but the governor soon found that only the captain general in Havana could treat on the terms requested by the representative of the Indians. Bowles then agreed to go to Havana in order to deal directly with the authorities there, and from Havana the captain general embarked him "very mysteriously" for Spain.¹⁹

This memorable journey was made on the frigate *Misisipi*, on which Bowles' old antagonist, ex-Governor Miró, was traveling to honorable retirement. Miró found Bowles a very interesting traveling companion, as did his wife, "mi Celeste," whose picture the versatile young soldier of fortune painted. He even prepared his own colorful autobiography for Don Estevan.²⁰

Authorities in Spain were no more able than the colonial officials to hit upon the correct treatment of their guest captive. They first threatened then cajoled. Finally in 1795 they decided to send him to the Philippines for safe-keeping. After two years, in 1797, he was embarked again for the Peninsula, but off the African coast Bowles

Legajo 203, cited in Arthur P. Whitaker, "Alexander McGillivray, 1789-1793," in *North Carolina Historical Review* (Raleigh, 1924-), V (1928), 303. See also, Leslie to Panton, March 22, 1792, in *Georgia Historical Quarterly*, XXII (1938), 291.

¹⁹ Bowles to Grenville, June 5, 1798, in Archivo Nacional de Cuba, Floridas, Legajo 5, No. 1; Barón de Carondelet to Bajamar, September 15, 1792, *ibid.*, Legajo 15, No. 78; Panton to Carondelet, April 12, 1792, in *Georgia Historical Quarterly*, XXII (1938), 289-90. Reports of the officers who captured Bowles (José de Hevia and Pedro Rousseau) are in Archivo General de Simancas, Sección de Guerra, Legajo 6916 (Photostat in North Carolina Historical Commission, translation in Webb Memorial Library). See also Caughey, *McGillivray of the Creeks*, 304-14.

²⁰ Miró to Aranda, June 19, 1792, and the autobiographical sketch for Miró, Archivo General de Simancas, Sección de Guerra, Legajo 6916. Caroline M. Burson, *The Stewardship of Don Estevan Miró, 1782-1792; A Study of Louisiana Based Largely on Documents in New Orleans* (New Orleans, 1940), 27-31.

escaped and made his way to Sierra Leone. There Governor Zachary Macaulay gave him passage to England.²¹

At this time Britain was openly at war with Spain. Bowles' plan to set up an Indian state in territory claimed by Spain offered a superb opportunity to embarrass the enemy. His suggestions therefore fell on attentive ears. Once more he was lodged at government expense and sent to Jamaica with a commission as brigadier general, with permission to recruit settlers and officials for his proposed state. With an advance guard he set out on H.M.S. *Fox* for the Bahamas. After obtaining further recruits there, he sailed on the same vessel for the mouth of the Apalachicola. On September 18, 1799, while trying to enter the mouth of the river, the *Fox* was wrecked near Dog Island. Those on board saved themselves with little more than their lives. Their immediate needs were supplied by Andrew Ellicott, the American boundary commissioner who was on the near-by mainland, but his refusal to supply anything that might help in making war on Spain was to be expected. Nothing daunted, Bowles ascended the river in a canoe to seek aid for his comrades and dispatched a number of Indians to take them off the island. In the meantime, the crew of the vessel had escaped on a privateer, so that only the future citizens of the proposed Indian state remained.²²

At a place five leagues up the river, which he called Wakiwa, Bowles set up his headquarters. There he called together a number of chiefs from some of the Lower Creek towns and conferred with them before October 6. By the twenty-fifth of that month he had formed what he called the "Supreme Council of Muskogee," assuming for himself the title of "Director General of Muskogee," and was issuing decrees

²¹ Documents for this period of Bowles' career are in Archivo Nacional de Cuba, Floridas, Legajo 5, No. 1. Bowles to Grenville, June 5, 1798, gives his Philippine experience.

²² Declaration of several of Bowles' followers are in Archivo Nacional de Cuba, Floridas, Legajo 5, No. 1. Especially interesting is that of Thomas Hugh Fergusson who came expecting to be collector of customs. See the *Journal of Andrew Ellicott* (Philadelphia, 1803), 226-38, 241; and Catherine Van Cortlandt Matthews, *Andrew Ellicott, His Life and Letters* (New York, 1908), 172-83.

in the name of the Council. These decrees usually began or ended with "God Save the State of Muskogee." Bowles' reason for adopting this name for his state is not evident. He may have proposed to include eventually in his nation the whole Muskogean linguistic family, comprising the Choctaws and Chickasaws as well as the Creeks, but it is hardly possible that he intended to omit the Cherokees, who were of Iroquoian stock. No ethnological reasoning can safely be attributed to Bowles, for he seems not to have taken into consideration the fact that a number of his supporters were from the Uchee (Uchi or Yuchi) villages along the Apalachicola.

Among the first of Bowles' decrees was one dated October 25, 1799, which declared "the ports of Apalachicola, Okwelockone, and Tampa," to be "free to all nations that are not at war with us." Another, of October 31, ordered all persons holding commissions from Spain or the United States to leave the territory of the State of Muskogee by November 8 "on pain of being held responsible at the risk of their lives," while a third, of November 26, offered settlers one hundred acres of land "within thirty miles of the Sea between our Free Port of Apalachicola and Sand Cape," with the right to purchase more by presenting a petition to the Supreme Council of Muskogee.

Since the three ports did not become immediate realities, Bowles restricted his energies for the time being to one alone. On November 29 he decreed that the ships of all friendly powers were to be welcome to the free port of Apalachicola after January 1, 1800, provided they paid duties of six pence a gallon on liquors and two and one-half per cent on all other merchandise.²³

Settlers and officials who had come on the *Fox* from Nassau were beginning to suspect that they had been lured to a false paradise and were in a quarrelsome mood with the Director General. Some were slipping away to the Spaniards; some of the Indians who visited the

²³ Translations of Bowles' decrees, together with other documents concerning them, are in Archivo Nacional de Cuba, Floridas, Legajo 5, No. 1. For English reprints, see *Carolina Gazette*, January 23, 1800, and *Georgia Gazette*, March 6, 1800. The former contains only the decree of October 31, 1799. For Thomas Hugh Fergusson's reaction to the situation, see Archivo Nacional de Cuba, Floridas, Legajo 1, No. 25.

"capital" of Muskogee failed to become supporters of the "state";²⁴ the expected reinforcements and supplies from the Bahamas still had not come and, to crown events, the Spanish authorities were gathering a force to destroy this "nest of pirates."

Although seriously hampered by British privateers cruising off the mouth of the Mississippi, the Marqués de Casa Calvo, now governor of Louisiana, dispatched a fleet of four galleys, four gunboats, a transport schooner, and two supply ships for the attack. Built to operate in shallow waters, these vessels left New Orleans early in December and, after having taken on reinforcements in Pensacola, managed to elude privateers by following the inland waterways along the coast and entered the Apalachicola River on January 27, 1800. Bowles and most of his followers escaped a force that was landed near the "Muskogee capital," but his Indian squaw was taken. After burning the huts at Wakiwa on February 3, the expedition dropped down the river and proceeded to St. Marks.

A conference was set for February 22 and invitations were sent to the Indians of the area by the commanders of the expedition, Manuel García and Pedro Olivier. Rewards were offered for the capture and delivery of Bowles to the Spaniards, but some of the chiefs warned them frankly that, although they were friends of Spain and the United States, they would receive as brothers any persons like Bowles who came from the king of England.

In order to frustrate any attempts at landing reinforcements or supplies, García and Olivier themselves cruised off shore and loyal Indian guards were posted on land. One such vessel from Nassau was taken after it ran aground, but the passengers escaped. Impatient of their fruitless wait, the commanders were withdrawing to Pensacola, leaving one galley on guard, when the appearance of Panton's vessels with supplies destined for St. Marks occasioned a delay. A ship of the fighting fleet was dispatched to convoy it to the fort where something of a surprise awaited the two newcomers.²⁵

²⁴ Archivo Nacional de Cuba, Floridas, Legajo 1, No. 25. Other declarations are in *ibid.*, Legajo 5, No. 1.

²⁵ The Spanish documents concerned with this expedition are in Archivo Nacional de

While Bowles' pursuers were seeking him in the vicinity of the Apalachicola River, he had gathered his followers, white and Indian, and had called together the "Supreme Council of Muskogee" at Este-funalga where he had been "authorized" on April 5, 1800, to declare war on His Catholic Majesty.²⁶ On April 9 his skirmishers appeared in the vicinity of the fort, and by the fifteenth its garrison was under siege. Under a flag of truce the commandant, Captain Tomás Portell, was informed of the declaration of war and called upon to surrender "by an honorable Capitulation." He, of course, refused, but on May 19 the garrison surrendered and was allowed to leave for Pensacola with the honors of war.

García and Olivier learned of the surrender of the fort from Portell as he passed them on his way to Pensacola as a paroled prisoner of war. Upon reporting to Governor Vicente Folch in Pensacola, the unfortunate captain was placed under arrest and sent to New Orleans, whence he was forwarded to Havana and confined in Morro Castle until 1806, when he was condemned by a court-martial and deprived of his rank.²⁷

Governor Folch, meanwhile, gathered all the forces at his disposal and set out to redeem Spanish honor and property. Bowles and his followers fled after a brief resistance, allowing the attackers to occupy the fort on June 23, 1800.²⁸ In spite of the governor's desperate efforts to take the fugitive with Spanish forces and friendly Indians, Bowles' influence among the Lower Creeks was sufficient to insure his liberty until 1803. With headquarters in the town of Miccosukee, not far

Cuba, Floridas, Legajo 5, No. 1. The story of the expedition against Bowles is summarized in Marqués de Casa Calvo to Marqués de Someruelos, May 10, 1800. Noteworthy is García's logbook, January 20 to March 14, 1800.

²⁶ See the reference to the declaration of war in the letter of marque printed below.

²⁷ Documents concerned with the siege are found in Archivo Nacional de Cuba, Floridas, Legajo 5, No. 1. Of particular interest are the capitulation and the correspondence between Bowles and Portell. A photostat of the capitulation is in the library of Dr. Mark F. Boyd of Tallahassee.

²⁸ Folch's correspondence concerning the attack is in Archivo Nacional de Cuba, Floridas, Legajo 5, No. 1, Legajo 2, No. 74, and Legajo 2, No. 19. A description of the attack, based on statements of Indians who were in the fort with Bowles, is found in *Augusta Chronicle and Gazette*, August 2, 1800.

from the present city of Tallahassee, he worked continually toward the advancement of his Indian state. He found it useless to try to retake the fort, which was now too well guarded by the Spaniards, so he directed his energies to the more lucrative business of preying on Spanish shipping. The letter of marque printed below is one instance of his efforts.

Commissioned a privateer on February 1, 1802, by June of that year the *Muskogee Mekko* (*Muskogee Chief*), under her owner, a certain Captain Johnson of New Providence, had captured two Spanish vessels—the *Betsy*, bound from New Orleans to Havana, and the *Calandria*, on its way from Mexico to Havana with "silver and other effects." Both were taken to the Apalachicola River to be rearmed for use in the navy of Muskogee.

Meanwhile, Director General Bowles had secured in New Providence another schooner, the *Favorite*, which sailed from the Bahamas for Apalachicola with cannon to arm prizes, but she fell into the hands of the Spaniards and was taken to St. Marks.²⁹ The Bowles menace on land and sea caused Spanish officials to redouble their efforts to blockade the "coast of Muskogee" and to capture the Director General.³⁰ Britain was no longer at war with Spain since the Peace of Amiens, March 27, 1802, and the United States was now ready to join forces with Spain and Panton, Leslie and Company to destroy Bowles, so his chances for success were waning.

William Panton was now dead, but the new head of the firm, John Forbes, was pressing the Indians for payment of debts and for damages inflicted by Bowles on company property in 1792 and in 1800. The United States wanted the company's assistance in obtaining cessions of land from the Indians on the Mississippi and Ocmulgee rivers. Forbes agreed to accept a land grant for himself in part payment pro-

²⁹ Declarations of four members of the crew of the *Betsy* and one of her passengers, and a declaration of one member of the crew of the *Calandria*, Havana, November 9-27, 1802, in Archivo Nacional de Cuba, Floridas, Legajo 5, No. 1. Further reports of the activities of the *Muskogee Mekko* and of Bowles himself are in *ibid.*, Legajo 2, No. 21.

³⁰ Instructions for the blockading vessels are in *ibid.*, Legajo 2, No. 21.

vided the Indians would rid themselves of Bowles.³¹ At the same time Governor Folch sent his son, Cadet Estevan Folch, to bribe the Indians to hand over the public enemy. The combination was too powerful for Bowles. Under pressure from Forbes, Folch, and Colonel Benjamin Hawkins, the United States Indian superintendent, the Creeks arrested Bowles in United States territory. He was then hurried away to Pensacola. From there he was relayed to New Orleans and Havana, but instead of being forwarded to Spain, he was lodged in Morro Castle by the authorities in Cuba.³² Maintaining that the Spanish courts had no jurisdiction over him, he refused to testify. The authorities were at a loss to know what to do with him. They nevertheless kept him shackled, hands and feet, in a dungeon. He refused to eat for so long a time that his life was in danger. He was then removed to the military hospital of San Ambrosio where he ended his career on December 23, 1805.³³

Bowles' death permanently removed from the Spanish-American frontier one of its most complicating factors, but it did not restore order. He had spread among the Lower Creeks discontent which made their country a rich field for the less able adventurers who followed him. We can only speculate on what he might have done had he lived to return during the War of 1812. History is poorer because he missed by nine years the chance to match his wits with Old Hickory.

³¹ A good account of the claims is in Cotterill, "A Chapter of Panton, Leslie and Company," *loc. cit.*, 275-92. See also, *Letter from the Secretary of Treasury, Transporting Copies of the Reports of the Commission of Land Claims in East and West Florida, February 22, 1825* (Washington, 1825).

³² Folch to Manuel de Salcedo, June 2 and 10, 1803; Folch to Marqués de Casa Irujo, June 8 and 10, 1803; together with correspondence of young Folch with his father, in Archivo Nacional de Cuba, Floridas, Legajo 5, No. 1. Published accounts of the capture of Bowles are in Arthur P. Whitaker, *The Mississippi Question, 1795-1803*, (New York, 1934), 172-75, and "A Journal of John Forbes, May, 1803," in *Florida Historical Quarterly*, IX (1930-1931), 279-89.

³³ Report of Andrés Codina (Surgeon of Morro Castle), October 17, 1805; Martínez de Campos to Someruelos, November [?], 1805, in Archivo Nacional de Cuba, Floridas, Legajo 5, No. 1. In the same bundle are documents concerning attempts to force Bowles to testify. See also, Francisco Calcagno, *Diccionario Biográfico Cubano* (New York, 1878), 131.

God save the state of Muskogee³⁴

His Excellency William Augustus Bowles
Director General of Muskogee &c &c &c —

To all people to whome these presents shall Come Greeting

Whereas His Catholic Majesty has for many years entertained evil intentions against this Nation and pursued measures every way injurious and hostile against us, wantonly violating the Rights that belong to us as a free and independent People has disregarded all remonstrance made by us to obtain redress and induce him to abandon his unfriendly intentions against us;³⁵ has treated our representatives with dissemulation and falsehood;³⁶ has suffered all good faith to be violated with impunity by his Governors in our vicinity;³⁷ Has formed treaties that Clearly manifest that his intentions were to Usurp the sovereignty of our Country,³⁸ and destroy our name as a people; and in the month of Feby 1800 did unprovoked with an armed force attack our Country, Burned our town of Achakwheethla made prisoners of our People Blocked up our Ports and otherwise distressed us, thus terminating all pacific negociation by an open attack³⁹ We the Director General of Muskogee being determined to take such measures as were necessary to defend our most sacred Rights; to defend the honor of this Nation and procure reparation and satisfaction for our injured Citizens with the advice and Consent of the Supreme Council of Muskogee held at Estefunalga the 5th day of April 1800 declared war against his Catholic Majesty and his Subjects and ordered that general reprisal be made both by Land and Sea⁴⁰ of the Goods Ships and Subjects of his Catholic Majesty. Therefore agreeable to the order made in Supreme Council bearing date as aforesaid we do hereby Commission the Schooner Muskogee Mekko to Cruise on the High Seas in a warlike manner and she is hereby Constituted; appointed

³⁴ These words are in a circle around the seal of the "State of Muskogee," in the upper left-hand corner of the manuscript.

The complete history of this document is not known. Some years ago it was offered for sale by a private dealer and purchased on behalf of the Manuscripts Division, Duke University Library, where it is now deposited.

³⁵ Bowles here refers to the various attempts he had made to negotiate with Spain and the steps taken by Spanish agents to thwart him.

³⁶ No doubt Bowles had especially in mind his own treatment between 1792 and 1797.

³⁷ A pointed comment on the deception used by Carondelet to capture him in 1792.

³⁸ The Indians considered the treaty of San Lorenzo a case of usurpation, since their territory was divided by Spain and the United States without their consent.

³⁹ The reference here is to the expedition led by Manuel García and Pedro Olivier which destroyed Bowles' capital. His decrees were dated from Wakiwa, although here he refers to his camp as Achakwheethla.

⁴⁰ This declaration of war was a preliminary to the attack on the fort at St. Marks. The first reprisals consisted of horse-stealing from Panton's establishment on the Wakulla, about four miles above the fort. Next came cattle-stealing in the vicinity of the fort, followed almost immediately by the siege of the fort itself.

and Commissioned to proceed to sea and to apprehend Sieze and take the Goods ships and subjects of his Catholic Majesty, by force of arms, and Conduct the same to the most convenient Port in order that they may be legally adjudged and condemned in our high Court of Admiralty.

And we do pray all Kings, Princes; Potentates; Republics and States as are our friends to give such aid and Protection in their Ports as may be needful We promising to do the like when by them required.

Given under our hand and sealed
with the seal of our office at our
head Quarters Mekkesuky⁴¹ this first
day of Febr.y 1802

Wm. A. Bowles

By his Excellencys Command
William McGirth C.C.A.

R H

⁴¹ Miccosukee was a few miles above the present city of Tallahassee.

Book Reviews

The Completion of Independence, 1790-1830. By John Allen Krout and Dixon Ryan Fox. *A History of American Life*, Volume V. Edited by Arthur M. Schlesinger and Dixon Ryan Fox. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944. Pp. xxiii, 487. Illustrations, bibliography. \$4.00.)

The publication of the volume under review brings to completion the twelve-volume *History of American Life*, a series which has the distinction of being the latest of the major collaborative histories of the United States, and the more abiding distinction of being the first such work that has in large measure shunned political events and emphasized social history. Because of this emphasis the *History of American Life* is of unusual interest to students of southern history; they have struggled with the problem of how to write history according to social and cultural patterns for a long time—perhaps longer than any other school of American historians. Out of all the twelve volumes, one might reasonably expect the present one to be among the best from the standpoint of the art of writing social history. Being the last to appear, its authors have had the advantage of observing the successes and failures of their collaborators and of reading the comments and criticisms evoked by the earlier volumes. Furthermore, one of the co-authors, the late President Dixon Ryan Fox of Union College, was a joint editor of the entire series.

On several counts *The Completion of Independence* deserves high praise. It is well written, and some of the phrasing is brilliant. The twenty-five illustrations are well chosen, and their value is enhanced by critical and explanatory notes. The text, the citations, and the bibliography indicate that a large and varied body of documentary and monographic material was consulted. The authors have dealt with many topics, and they dealt with them with an understanding of trends in Europe as well as in America. Above all, they have displayed sound understanding and deft craftsmanship in fitting the varied materials of social history into a meaningful pattern. The sections and the chapters have been molded into a book that starts somewhere and gets somewhere.

The principal theme is suggested by the title, *The Completion of Independence*, and by a quotation from Noah Webster, first published in 1790, which includes the following words: "Americans, unshackle your minds, and act like independent beings. . . . You have . . . a national character to establish and extend your wisdom and virtues." While the authors disclaim believing that America had achieved full cultural independence by the terminal date of their

book, nevertheless they are primarily concerned with such progress as was made in that direction. Their tracing of this progress is somewhat like the construction of a mosaic; brief accounts of change and progress in many fields—too many even to list in a review—are assembled for the purpose. It may be questioned, however, whether the terminal date, the year 1830, was a wise choice. The materials are less closely integrated to the central theme after the year 1816 is passed; and the last chapter, entitled "New Sectional Tensions," introduces a new development.

If sectionalism was becoming an important trend in American life before 1830, one may properly inquire why so little attention was given to the South and West. The heavy emphasis on the North and East allows some developments of much significance, such as the creation of the earlier state universities in the South and West, to go almost unnoticed. Furthermore, the reader is left in uncertainty as to the extent of western and southern participation in many social and cultural movements. For example, he is told of the existence of English, Irish, Scotch, and German "national" societies in several towns above the Potomac, but he is not informed that similar organizations were in Charleston and New Orleans. The existence of New England societies in southern towns—a phenomenon which would seem to have some significance in the history of American sectionalism—is entirely missed. Furthermore, Virginia is not named among the states that pioneered in the creation of hospitals for the care of the indigent insane—yet Virginia had two such institutions before 1830; the publication of St. George Tucker's five-volume edition of *Blackstone's Commentaries* in 1803 is unnoticed in the discussion of trends in legal training and practices; and the place of the law school of the University of Virginia in the evolution of the study of political science evoked no comment.

In calling attention to omissions such as these, the reviewer does not mean to imply that each racial, religious, economic, and other group should be apportioned space according to its size, or each section of the United States in proportion to its acreage. But if sectional tensions were becoming evident, ought not there to have been more of an effort to discover whether earlier social and cultural life contained the germs of this sectionalism? A more equal balance might have afforded a better answer. But as it is, one hardly knows how to interpret the emphasis upon life in the North and the East. Should one conclude that the nation was much alike in all its parts despite inequalities in emphasis? Or does the scant attention to the South and West indicate that they were different, either through a lag or through development along different lines? In brief, one would like to be told more clearly whether there were factors in American life between 1790 and 1830 that forecast the conflict which was to come in the next generation.

Thomas Cresap: Maryland Frontiersman. By Kenneth P. Bailey. (Boston: The Christopher Publishing House, 1944. Pp. ix, 322. Illustrations, map, appendices, bibliography. \$4.00.)

Thomas Cresap's contemporaries called him various names. The Pennsylvanians with whom he quarreled in the Susquehanna River region termed him the "Maryland Monster." The Indians who used his western Maryland post as a stopping place knew him as "Big Spoon." The British officers who came into contact with him during the campaigns of the French and Indian War dubbed him "Rattlesnake Colonel." Others referred to him as a "dangerous and barbarous Man," a "criminal," an "incendiary," and a "vile fellow."

Dr. Bailey says (p. 168) that Cresap "was one of the most dynamic individuals among those who fashioned colonial America" and that he "did as much as any single person to further the westward movement." To support these assertions and "to present a critical study of the life of this noteworthy character" (p. 12), Dr. Bailey has assembled scraps of evidence from many sources. The result is a semi-chronological, semi-topical piece of writing, with the events of Cresap's career traced by years and then by subjects.

The early chapters of this study describe Thomas Cresap's difficulties with his Pennsylvania neighbors and the so-called Conojacular War of 1730-1736. The climax of this colonial boundary dispute was reached when Cresap was seized and paraded through the streets of Philadelphia, shouting, "Damn it, this is one of the Prettyest Towns in Maryland." The middle chapters deal with the settlement of Old Town on the Potomac River and Cresap's great interest in land speculation. The familiar narratives of the Ohio Company and of the French and Indian War are retold, with appropriate emphasis on the part played by Cresap in each instance. The later chapters tell about Cresap's political activities, his connections with the Indians, and his last years. The entire work gives the impression of a collection of items plucked from here and there and connected by brief explanatory paragraphs. There are numerous and lengthy quotations—too many and too long for the sake of readability and interest.

The tone of Dr. Bailey's work is laudatory and defensive. Some effort is made to weigh the evidence for and against Cresap, but it is apparent that the author was convinced from the start that his subject was "outstanding among all colonial frontiersmen" and that the final verdict would be favorable. It is true that Cresap was an important figure during the eighteenth century, but one suspects that he may not have been quite so much a worker for the common good as this study would have us believe.

Dr. Bailey makes a contribution in his four appendices, gathering in one place all the known correspondence of Thomas Cresap, the official views of the Maryland-Pennsylvania boundary dispute, and data on Cresap's financial dealings with the Maryland government. Additional information is supplied in

footnotes at the end of the book. The bibliography includes English, French, and American manuscript sources, and a variety of printed collected sources and secondary materials. An error in the spelling of the name of the "Gilmore [Gilmor] Papers" in the Maryland Historical Society indicates a lack of understanding of the origin of some of the documents used.

The Maryland Historical Society

WILLIAM D. HOYT, JR.

The Midwest Pioneer: His Ills, Cures, and Doctors. By Madge E. Pickard and R. Carlyle Buley. (Crawfordsville, Indiana: R. E. Banta, 1945. Pp. 339. Illustrations, bibliography. \$5.00.)

This is the story of the pioneer's aches and pains and snakebites. It is also the story of the pioneer doctor, of professional buzzards, of water cures, homeopaths, and phrenologists in the Ohio Valley one hundred years ago. Doctor and settler suffered extreme hardships, and after reading this book one fully appreciates the dedication inserted by the authors: "To the Pioneer Doctor who boldly faced the wilderness; and to the Pioneer who bravely faced the Doctor."

Although the newspapers and local chambers of commerce were reluctant to report sickness in their localities, there were few communities in the Midwest in the first half of the nineteenth century which escaped the ravages of bilious fevers, cholera, consumption, typhoid, the ague, and smallpox. Because of the ignorance and superstitions of the people and the general lack of knowledge and training among the country doctors the mortality rate was high. The degenerative diseases never attracted much attention in the West because most people did not live long enough to develop them. Even by mid-century, although medical science and especially surgery had made considerable progress and the new ideas were being practiced in the more advanced communities and in the city hospitals, the rural patient was still at the mercy of the quack, the "Indian Doctor," or his own superstitions which resembled the medical witchcraft of the Middle Ages.

The authors have placed great stress on the career and practices of Richard Carter, of Kentucky, one of the most remarkable potion brewers of all time. Carter's life story, as told by himself, was one of afflictions, accidents, and general misfortunes. As a youth he did everything in the book from stuffing the family cat into a pot of boiling cabbage to falling off a chimney. His own peculiar illnesses turned his attention to cures and medical lore. Eventually he became known as the herb or vegetable doctor, but many of his prescriptions included ingredients which did not grow in the ground. One of his favorite medicines was dog oil, not ordinary dog oil, but oil cooked from a dog that had been stuffed with eggs, turpentine, brimstone, tobacco, and red fishing worms. Dr. Carter was an expert when dealing with hysterics or "hypo," as it was called by his contemporaries. The case histories of the hypo patients make

interesting reading, especially the case of the man who believed he had a belly full of quacking ducks. One wonders how the authors could control their own hysterics long enough to get it all down on paper.

Carter's influence was widespread and numerous herb doctors followed in his footsteps. His most famous student was Dr. S. N. Selman of Indiana, but other Carter "students" appeared in Ohio and Kentucky. Most of these disciples of the herb cult published books in which they gave the Indians credit for many of their prescriptions. *The Indian Guide to Health*, *The North American Indian Doctor*, and *The Indian Doctor's Practice of Medicine* are a few of the titles in this series. These books were very popular. Not only did they contain remedies for piles, worms, and ague, but also information on rat poison, freckle lotion, and how to keep vegetables in storage. In addition to the so-called "powwow" books were innumerable domestic medical books which were written (or plagiarized) by regular physicians. One of the most popular books of this type was Gunn's *Domestic Medicine or Poor Man's Friend*, originally published in Knoxville, Tennessee. This book ran through two hundred and thirteen editions and sold over one hundred thousand copies by 1885. All of the domestic books recommended calomel, bleeding, opium, castor oil, Peruvian bark, and epsom salts, but the most popular prescriptions began: "Take three pints of good rye whiskey and add . . ."

But not all the men who administered medical aid were quacks or irregulars. The well-known Drake, Dudley, Gross, McDowell, Peter, Brown, Morrow, Yandell, and others appear in this account of midwestern medicine. There are also brief descriptions of some of the early medical colleges: Transylvania, Louisville Medical Institute, Cincinnati College, Indiana Central, Wisconsin Medical College, Michigan, and Rush Medical College of Chicago. The authors have included judiciously a summary of the pertinent facts pertaining to the development of hospitals and infirmaries and the early drug stores and soda fountains. Considerable space has been given to the phrenologists and other cults of the period.

One of the most enlightening passages in the book is the description of dental practices, which is regrettably brief. Dentistry was more primitive than medicine; in fact, it was not recognized as a legitimate profession. Many of the itinerant dentists, usually mere tooth-pullers, were criticized severely by press and public. One newspaper asserted that "A Tooth Drawer is as forward as he is foolish—as important as he is ignorant—and as impenetrable as he is impertinent."

In spite of certain weaknesses, this book is an important synthesis of pioneer medicine. The authors did not intend it to be an exhaustive study, but perhaps additional details on dentistry, medical schools, and hospitals and less detail on quacks would have produced a more balanced book. This reviewer questions a few statements pertaining to the history of the medical colleges. For example

on page 124 the authors state that the Transylvania Medical Department ceased to operate in 1856-1857 and that the department was formally abolished in 1859. Actually, class work did not cease until after 1859. There are medical theses on file at Transylvania for the year 1859. While the sources listed in the notes and in the bibliography are impressive, the authors overlooked the rich material in books and manuscripts in the Medical Library at Transylvania. Furthermore, especially where Kentucky medicine is concerned, they have apparently overlooked more recent studies and relied too much on the older and less reliable *Filson Club Publications*.

The format of the book is distinguished. It is set in Garamond, printed on rag paper, which is indeed a luxury in these days of shortages, and bound in hand-blocked English stock.

Transylvania College

F. GARVIN DAVENPORT

Florida During the Territorial Days. By Sidney Walter Martin. (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1944. Pp. ix, 308. Maps, bibliography. \$3.00.)

There are in this book quite a few statements which will probably bring acute mental distress to the specialists in Florida history. Among these is the one that Andrew Jackson as governor of Florida "could collect any new tax that he saw fit to levy, or confirm any land claims which might be unsettled" (p. 18). Another is that the Forbes land grant was declared void by the Supreme Court (p. 172). The specialists will find it difficult to believe that R. H. Long edited the *Journal* of the St. Joseph Convention and the *Laws* of the territory (p. 283), and will be inclined to doubt if "any state coming into the Union was required by the Constitution to have 30,000 inhabitants" (p. 258). They will wonder at the gross error in the population statistics for West Florida in 1840 (p. 109), and will certainly view with surprise, if not admiration, the varying distances between St. Joseph and Apalachicola (pp. 175, 176). Also, the critic will notice many inaccuracies in dates, and an eccentricity in the spelling of names hardly to be ascribed to the variants in his source material. The reviewer cheerfully assumes that these and kindred errors have resulted not from ignorance but from carelessness—perhaps in transcribing notes or reading proof.

In this study Jackson is presented in orthodox fashion as a ruthless, imperious, explosive bull-in-the-china-shop, whose appointment by an otherwise intelligent President must remain as one of the minor mysteries of our political history. As for Jackson's successors, Professor Martin's enthusiasm for Duval is restrained. Duval spent as much time as possible in Kentucky and punctuated his Florida residence by threats to resign—in both of which endeavors he apparently had the cordial co-operation of a considerable part of

the Florida population. His principal achievement as governor was, apparently, the placing of the capital at Tallahassee as a compromise between the conflicting ambitions of Pensacola and St. Augustine. Eaton's two years were largely nullified by marital difficulties. The measure of Call's success as governor may be inferred from the fact that although he was a Jackson satellite he was removed by Van Buren; his re-appointment by Harrison did not increase his popularity in Democratic Florida. Reed, sandwiched between two terms of Call, had to keep troops in Tallahassee to insure a domestic tranquility made precarious by political passions and by Indian wars.

Professor Martin has cut his way with commendable brevity through the jungles of Florida politics and Seminole wars, and has utilized the space saved in an account of social and economic development. Middle Florida dominated the territory. There were the chief plantations, the densest population, and the most slaves. There the Tallahassee Railroad was opened in 1836 to carry out its cotton, and there St. Marks was developed as its chief port. A rival of St. Marks was Apalachicola, prospering on the trade of the river of that name. Apalachicola was challenged vigorously by St. Joseph until 1841, when an unbeatable combination of hurricane and yellow fever laid the latter metropolis low. In West Florida, Pensacola, without river communication inland, was unable to exploit its fine harbor; and in East Florida, St. Augustine was gradually overshadowed by Jacksonville, rising at the ancient cow ford of the St. Johns. South Florida hardly existed except for Key West. Florida was a frontier ambitious for canals and banks. It got no canals (although it has not yet lost hope) and it got its banks to its sorrow. Built on hope and credit (state credit) many of them crashed in the panic of 1837.

There was much sectional ill will between East Florida and West Florida, and the feeling led to agitation for division of the territory, annexation of West Florida to Alabama, and removal of the capital to various points of the compass. The two sections could not agree even on statehood and the constitution of 1838 was adopted by such a small majority that Congress was encouraged to delay admission till 1845.

The bibliography of thirteen pages shows that the author has had access to practically all the manuscript and printed sources, newspapers, local histories, and official records bearing on the territorial history. It is difficult to see what more he could have done except to investigate the county records, and that is, as a rule, impracticable unless the investigator has more than one lifetime at his disposal. The book is evidence in itself that the bibliography has been used as well as listed. Notwithstanding its many errors, it is in fact a good book, well-written, and providing its readers with quite the fullest account of territorial Florida that has yet appeared in print.

The Idea of Progress in America, 1815-1860. By Arthur Alphonse Ekirch. *Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law*, No. 511. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1944. Pp. 305. Bibliography. \$3.50.)

This is an important work. It contributes significantly to a larger understanding of the dynamic folk philosophy of the romantic American masses during the Middle Period. The acceptance and general significance of the idea of progress as part of that popular system of thought has been indicated by earlier students of the period. Unlike its associated ideas, however, it has been the object of little or no systematic analysis. The only exception to this has been Merle Curti's brief discussion of the acceptance of the idea by American liberals in the eighteenth century. The Beards, in *The American Spirit*, regard it as the basic conception in the idea of civilization, but they do not isolate the idea of progress for separate study. Mr. Ekirch, therefore, has pioneered in the development of an important field of intellectual history. He has produced a monograph that must be used by all students seeking a thorough comprehension of American democratic thought in the era before the Civil War.

His purpose is to describe the adaptation and popularization of a conception which had been introduced in America earlier and was being re-enforced by continued borrowing in the nineteenth century from English, French, and German scholars. His initial assumption is that the idea of progress was part of the rich heritage of the European "Enlightenment." In this he follows Curti, and repudiates thereby Ralph Gabriel's thesis which stresses the indigenous origins of the idea in the frontier process and Protestant millenarianism.

The problem involved in achievement of the monograph's purposes is both difficult and complex. Not all of its several aspects are consciously faced and resolved by the author. In general, any study of ideological transmission, as in other fields of cultural interchange, must draw a careful distinction between the easy acceptance of a novel idea by a patrician, more or less cosmopolitan elite, such as the ruling class of the colonial seaboard before 1815, and the adaptation and assimilation of the concept to the largely indigenous conceptual pattern of folk thought. This last is much more difficult of accomplishment and of demonstration. The adherents of the folk pattern must necessarily reject any alien concept that is clearly antagonistic to the values and purposes of the native system. In accounting for the acceptance of such an alien idea as that of progress into American folk thought, therefore, it is necessary first to show that it satisfied adequately one or more of the felt needs of the populace and then that an essential harmony existed between the novel idea and the traditional faith. To demonstrate or prove mass acceptance of the new idea is also a two-fold task. The sources must first be canvassed to indicate the extent to which the alien idea won verbal and conscious inclusion within the developing folk pattern. Finally, it is necessary to measure the degree to which the new concept

influenced popular action, as illustrated by typical individuals and policies or by the development of the whole society. Only then can the real significance of the imported idea for the native culture be learned. Such tests must be applied rigorously to the study of the supposed effects of the stream of technical devices, art forms, institutions, and ideas which immigrants and native enthusiasts have brought to America over three centuries, if the cultural history of this continent is to merge from the realm of easy generalization into that of a systematic, demonstrable branch of the historian's art.

The requirements of such a method are met moderately well by Mr. Ekirch's study. Although he leaves to other scholars the work of analyzing the actual methods of transfer to America, his introduction casts valuable incidental light upon probable origins of the idea of progress and the process of transmission. He then describes the favorable atmosphere resulting from the rapid material advancement of America which predisposed the general public to accept the new theory of social development. Little attention is paid, however, to the psychological necessities of a youthful nation, whose republican system and immature culture required justification and the support of an optimistic faith in the face of the continued ascendancy of European cultural standards and its superior political, monarchical power. These might well have been related to the popular acceptance of the idea of progress, as Mr. Curti has related them to the continuing influence of Lockean thought in the period.

The dialectical method is employed largely as the means of demonstrating the popular acceptance of the idea and its invocation by American patriots and representative men in successive fields of thought and action. Particularly important is the documentation of its influence upon political and economic thought, social reform, religious thought, the education crusade, and the slavery controversy, in which wide acceptance and utilization of the concept is demonstrated. The value of this contribution, however, is limited by the variety and the sectional character of the sources used. These are restricted to an impressive list of magazines, collected writings and speeches, and contemporary books and pamphlets which were found in a few leading eastern depositories. As a result the study was deprived of the use of many southern and particularly of important western sources. Failure to make extensive use of newspapers or labor and agricultural periodicals deprived it of the light which the press then cast upon the daily thought and action of the masses, a lacuna that is not filled by utilization of a few collections of private papers of leading men. Despite these reservations, little doubt remains of the wide acceptance of the idea of progress by middle class and professional men in the North Atlantic states and without serious reservations elsewhere save in the plantation South and among the Catholic clergy.

The functional significance of the idea of progress in America is clearly indicated, but not developed, by short references to its application in the cult of self improvement, perfectionism, and the expansionist movement. Little

appreciation is shown of the possibility that mass acceptance of the idea may have played a role of major importance in releasing the ebullient energy that Alexis de Tocqueville observed as a salient characteristic of American democracy in the Jacksonian era. Here a useful contrast might have been drawn between the effect of full acceptance of Progress upon the northeast and of its qualification or rejection in the plantation South, particularly in view of Wilbur J. Cash's eloquent description of the dynamic implication for the "New South" movement of post-bellum acceptance of the idea in that region. Equally valuable would have been an investigation of the functional importance of the idea in the West, whose exuberant optimism might have been linked to the conviction that it was destined peculiarly to be the scene of progress. This is more than suggested by the writings and career of Dr. Daniel Drake of Cincinnati, the speculative spirit, and the cultural aspirations of communities half emerging from the log cabin frontier. In northeast and northwest alike, the lyceum movement, the increasing mechanics and mercantile libraries and institutes, labor's support of public education, and the widespread quest of knowledge among humble folk offer conclusive evidence of incorporation of the idea of progress into the folk philosophy and daily living of the masses.

Connecticut College

CHESTER MCA. DESTLER

The Church College of the Old South. By Albea Godbold. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1944. Pp. xi, 221. Appendices, bibliography. \$3.00.)

This is a study of the rise and the character of the church colleges of the four major denominations in the Old South—a region limited here to the states of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. It is another excellent addition to the increasing number of volumes published in recent years on phases of college life in the South.

The Episcopalians and Presbyterians were leaders in education from their earliest origins. The former, however, were too weak numerically to establish but one college, William and Mary, in the Old South before 1860. The Presbyterians, with more general interest and much greater numerical strength than the Episcopalians, became dominant in the field of education and before the Civil War had established five colleges—all of which are in operation today. The Baptist Church began with definite prejudices against education, especially against education for the ministry. The need, however, for a better trained clergy to carry on the work of foreign and domestic missions led to the erection of colleges. John Wesley's educational training clearly set a standard for Methodists who, despite a late start, by 1840 owned or controlled twelve colleges and academies in the four states under consideration.

Although William and Mary was the only college of church origin in the Old South before 1820, the number had risen to twenty-five or more by 1860.

The desire for an educated ministry is chief among the ten reasons advanced by the author for the founding of colleges. Nine other reasons arose from varying motives and desires—to fulfill the function of religion, to lower the cost of education, to render a service, to promote denominational loyalty, to extend denominational influence, to quicken denominational rivalry, to increase evangelism, to foster sectional interests, and to neutralize and even to surpass the state universities.

In general the academic level maintained by the church colleges was not high. Colleges were too poor financially to provide libraries, equipment, and staff necessary and competent to do a high grade of work. The courses of study remained virtually the same between 1830 and 1860. The curricula were overcharged with ancient languages and mathematics. Some concessions were made, for in 1852 Mercer provided a course "for those who may not have the time, the ability, or the inclination to study the ancient languages." Because little time was devoted to athletics, there was much opportunity for debating societies to discuss such subjects as slavery, which was strongly defended and found morally not wrong.

In order to protect the morals of the youth, church colleges were often established in remote areas, theoretically removed from great temptations. Yet there was much difficulty in enforcing an elaborate code of conduct, filled with regulations "more negative than positive." Faculties seriously sought to maintain a religious atmosphere in strict regard for the ideals of the churches. Compulsory attendance at prayers, chapel services, and church was so diligently enforced that good behavior often proved difficult to maintain. Revivals of religion periodically checked the exuberance of youth, converted many students, and turned some to the ministry as a career.

The church forces feared and criticized the state universities as godless institutions, patronized to a large extent by the rich and the aristocratic. The Methodists and Baptists complained that they were not proportionately represented on the faculties of the state universities—a thrust at the Presbyterians who rightfully dominated there. Although there were some exceptions, professors with various denominational affiliations left church colleges to accept more lucrative positions in state universities. While the state universities maintained a higher academic standard, there is convincing evidence that morals were better in the church colleges. In the political and social life of the Old South the influence of the stronger and wealthier state universities was greater than that of the church colleges. Despite the shortcomings of the latter, their contributions are written large on many a page of southern history.

The title of the book is too inclusive: the term "Old South" is here restricted to four states, and the book is almost wholly limited to the education of men, practically overlooking the existence of some fifty academies and colleges for women. Slight attention is paid to the highly important matter of financing the colleges. Here was a real struggle and herein lay the cause of many a provoking

problem. Undoubtedly the author gave much study to finances, for his conclusions and his extensive bibliography give some evidence of it. Regardless of this criticism, Mr. Godbold has written a book that by its excellence refutes many of the trite and hackneyed statements about doctoral dissertations.

Agnes Scott College

WALTER B. POSEY

Journal of a Southern Student, 1846-48, with Letters of a Later Period. By Giles J. Patterson. Edited by Richmond Croom Beatty. (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1944. Pp. 105. Illustrations. \$1.75.)

This small volume contains a journal kept by Giles J. Patterson of Spartanburg, South Carolina, while a student at the South Carolina College during the years 1846-1848 and some forty-five letters written by Patterson, then a successful lawyer and man of affairs at Chester, in the same state, to his nephew, Giles Wilson, while the latter was preparing for and attending Wofford College in the 1880's. There is also included a brief biographical note on Patterson by Henry Nelson Snyder, president emeritus of Wofford College, and a thirteen-page introduction by Richmond Croom Beatty, a member of the department of English at Vanderbilt University.

As one of thirteen children orphaned by the death of their father in 1842, Giles Patterson took his college life seriously. He began his journal with the motto: "I was well; I wished to be better; here I am." He had little time or inclination for the student escapades so common at the South Carolina College at that period; he was disgusted with student drinking and sartorial display; and he looked with a certain amount of up-country distrust upon the more elegant students from Charleston. The pages of his journal are filled mainly with long digests of professors' lectures, particularly those of Francis Lieber, for whose distinguished scholarship this young South Carolinian appears to have entertained a high regard. There is a brief account of Daniel Webster's visit to the college in 1847, and a few references are made to other events occurring on the campus; but in the main the journal is concerned with its author's reaction to his teachers and preoccupation with his studies rather than a description of general campus activities.

A fancied slight in the matter of some grades touched the young diarist's honor at the end of his senior year, with the result that he refused to deliver the required senior oration and consequently was forced to leave without his diploma. An interesting insight into the peculiar tribal loyalties of South Carolina is afforded by the fact that Patterson's son, resenting this apparent injustice to one whose name he bore, finally succeeded in having the degree awarded in 1934, eighty-six years after its recipient had ended his career as a student and forty-three years after his death.

Patterson's letters to his nephew reveal his character in the more mature years of his life, indicating a continuation of the same industry and earnestness

that were evident during his student days. Addressed to a young man who had lost his father and for whom the writer had consented to act as guardian, they abound in good advice: how to spend one's time profitably, what books to read, the advantage of buying books instead of a gold watch, the foolishness of joining a college fraternity, and frequent admonitions against wasting money. How well the nephew profited by this advice is not recorded, but that he treasured the letters is obvious from the fact that they were found carefully preserved in an attic trunk after his death in 1931.

Although it can scarcely be claimed for these items that they are of particular distinction or that they will attract any wide interest, they nevertheless deserved a more competent editing. The introduction betrays hasty writing, editorial inconsistencies, and inadequate proofreading. For example, "T. H. Thornwell" appears in the introduction (p. 15) but is correctly given as James H. Thornwell in a footnote accompanying the text (p. 36); Maximilian "La Bord" in the introduction (p. 16) but correctly as La Borde in a footnote (p. 27); and "'San Juan Alloa' [sic]" in a quotation from the text (p. 14) but "San Juan de Ulloa [sic]" in the text itself (p. 51). Much of the explanatory material on Francis Lieber (pp. 17-18) is taken bodily from a recent article by Frank Freidel in the *Journal of Southern History*; several of the sentences are in quotations, it is true, but without provenance or credit. In the absence of any explanation, one would like to know whether the numerous long lapses between successive entries in the journal represent genuine lacunae or deletions made by the editor.

North Carolina State College

JAMES W. PATTON

Deep Delta Country. By Harnett T. Kane. (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1944, Pp. xx, 283. Bibliography. \$3.00.)

Lying to the southeastward of New Orleans is the strangest, least-known, and least-understood region in the United States. It is the deep delta of the mighty Mississippi, the bountiful lap of the Father of Waters. Voyagers have stood on the decks of steamers, slowly plowing upstream, and have wondered what lay beyond the levees—what peoples lived among the small verdant fields, what creatures roamed the mysterious swamp lands beyond. Rumor, fiction, and legend blew from its vastnesses, but through the years the researcher and the historian stalked by, sidetracked into fields and to projects easier of understanding. The land awaited the coming of its chronicler.

The saga of the deep delta is now on the printed page and only Harnett Kane could have written it. A Gayarré would have presented a mixture of fact and fancy; a Fortier would have skimmed the historical surface; others would have probed here and there—competent enough in resurrecting certain details but wholly unqualified to complete the composing picture. Born to the region and steeped in its lore and legend, Mr. Kane has dug deeply into numerous

printed, archival, and manuscript sources. He has traveled by steamer, automobile, pirogue, and by foot over the length and breadth of the delta's peculiar terrain; has lived with peoples of diverse nationalities, creeds, and occupations; and has eaten poignantly seasoned gombos and jambalayas with Isleños and Tockos. He has sought evidences of *logaroos* and *feus de follet* and has inquired of remede women for recipes of curious concoctions. He knows, understands, and feels the human and material atmosphere of the delta country.

Deep Delta Country is a series of brilliantly written, historically accurate, pulsating essays which present in chronological and topical form the story of the Mississippi's border lands along the last hundred-odd miles of its tortuous course. It is the tale of a land which has been a determining battle ground of the destiny of the nation, both during the colonial period and during the South's struggle for political independence. After an introductory chapter on the geography of the region, the author initiates the highly descriptive and interpretive tour of the swamp lands. Peculiarly interesting individuals pass in review; Pierre Denis de la Ronde, who built a Versailles-like palace on the banks of the river; Maunsell White, an Irishman out of Kentucky, who became so acclimated that he is chiefly remembered today for his famous pepper sauce which is still universally used along southern Louisiana's bayous; Sir Edward Pakenham, of Napoleonic reputation, who lost a great battle and his life to a militarily-untutored Tennessean; as well as a host of others, prominent or lowly folk who inhabited the region. Strange national mixtures and individuals are presented who drew still stranger livelihoods from the moisture-soaked earth or from the fresh or salty waters along the fringes. Peculiar folkways and customs pass in kaleidoscopic panorama, factually accurate but mindful of that netherland between fact and fiction. Hewitt L. Ballou parades triumphantly through a whole chapter, an inclusion which brings satisfaction to those privileged to be friends of the fabulous big "Little Doctor." The volume is the outstanding contribution of the American Folkways Series and stands as a literary and historical monument to an extraordinary land and its singular people.

Louisiana State University

EDWIN ADAMS DAVIS

Charles Schreiner, General Merchandise: The Story of a Country Store. By J. Evetts Haley. (Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 1944. Pp. xi, 73. Illustrations, bibliography. \$3.50.)

This is a charming essay, attractively printed, and illustrated with eighteen sketches by H. D. Bugbee, "Western artist of distinction." There is not a footnote, but a page is devoted to human and documentary sources, which are cited collectively "In Verification and Acknowledgment." It is the story of a country store in the hill country of Texas, of its founder and the founder's expanding career, and of the heirs and successors, who have continued the business and

the tradition. It is an eloquent and sympathetic story of vigorous human "stock that sprang out of the crowded soil of Europe to flourish on the spacious frontiers of Texas." It starts with Charles Schreiner and his little store at Kerrville, a shingle-makers' camp on the Guadalupe, some seventy-five years ago. It traces the business "from a hut of weathered cypress slabs to . . . spacious quarters built of native stone." It shows such additional enterprise as dealings in shingles, wool, furs, sheep, cattle, and other products, acquisition of a private empire of lands, and ventures into banking. Inevitably such a story is a tribute to the name of Schreiner and what it stands for in business enterprise. Truly, in business, as in other walks of life, nothing succeeds like success.

The author weaves in a few choice anecdotes, incidents, and sayings of country-store characters. But this type of material has to be limited in telling such a large story, covering seventy-five years, in seventy pages. It is limited mainly to what throws light directly on the character of Captain Schreiner. After getting the country store started for the reader, the author seems somewhat in a hurry to get on to the great department store of "Charles Schreiner Company Today." The result is a sort of tantalizing preview of what might be a bulky volume compact with social history. The index of one page consists mainly of names of persons.

Vanderbilt University

H. C. NIXON

The Wilson Era: Years of Peace, 1910-1917. By Josephus Daniels. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1944. Pp. xvi, 615. Illustrations. \$4.00.)

All historians and students of American history who are acquainted with the two earlier volumes—*Tar Heel Editor* and *Editor in Politics*—of this distinguished Southerner's autobiography will welcome this third, but not the last, segment of this excellent work. Like both of the preceding volumes, *The Wilson Era* could have been shortened considerably without loss of value. Although the style is fascinating, there are numerous quotations, some of which are too long, and a few of them from unannounced sources. The scholar will regret the omission of footnotes, but the index is ample and accurate. Dozens of pictures illustrate generously the sixty-two chapters, while seventeen cartoons contribute zest and amusement.

There is no doubt as to the importance of this treatise for an understanding of Woodrow Wilson's administration. Much of the national scene is merely repainted with the Daniels stroke, but some of the blurred background is brightened and many little personal niches, hitherto unknown, are now for the first time brought into focus.

Wilson's Secretary of the Navy is on the center of the stage, but since this is part of his memoirs it would be unfair to quibble over that fact. Of the horde

of people, men and women, mostly Democrats but with a sprinkling of Republicans, who drift in and out of the author's spotlight nearly all are his friends. This multitude of friends is the greatest emolument of public service for an honest man, and Josephus Daniels was always honest.

A generation ago President Wilson was lauded and condemned as a precedent breaker. Certainly he was no more an innovator than the Tar Heel editor in his cabinet. One can mention only a few of the significant changes in the Navy Department during the years 1913-1917. The Navy was strengthened as an educational institution by establishing "a school on every ship," civilians were named to the faculty of the Naval Academy, resignations of Annapolis graduates from the Navy were refused, hazing at the institution was abolished, and Annapolis appointees were required to serve a year as enlisted seamen.

The American Navy, taking its cue from European navies, had developed a dangerous caste system, but Daniels remedied this lack of democracy by housing officers and enlisted men under the same roof. By democratic referendum, the officers' uniforms were changed, the promotional basis was made one of merit and sea service, instead of seniority, and, by secretarial order, intoxicants were banned in the Navy.

To gain observational knowledge of the various phases of the naval program the Secretary went on extensive tours of inspection—tours which included a flight in an airplane and a journey by submarine. As a result of information gained, slush monopolistic profiteers in the armor plate and smokeless powder industries were forced to wave the white flag of defeat when the government began the manufacture of these necessities at greatly reduced cost to the taxpayers. An eight-year fight for the preservation of the naval oil reserves was begun, only to be lost when Harding and the "Ohio gang" came into power in 1921.

In 1915 plans for preparedness and defense were adopted. This program embraced the creation of a Navy Consulting Board, the restoration of the almost vanished Merchant Marine, and building the "most adequate navy in the world." Although preparing for war, Daniels took steps for peace when he sought a world conference to promote international naval agreement.

With two exceptions, the relations between the Secretary of the Navy and the other members of the President's official family were cordial. Lansing "had no consecration to peace or to democracy," and was *persona non grata* to Daniels. Colonel House, unofficial cabinet member, was branded a liar and an ingrate. Between Daniels and Wilson it was love at first sight, and their relations remained extremely close.

Memphis State College

GEORGE C. OSBORN

Historical News and Notices

The Executive Council of the Southern Historical Association has voted by mail ballot to cancel the annual meeting scheduled to be held in November at Birmingham, Alabama. This decision was made in compliance with an order from the Office of Defense Transportation restricting meetings involving the attendance of fifty or more out-of-town participants. As in 1942 and 1943, the annual election of officers will be held by mail ballot later in the year.

The following have been appointed to serve as the Committee on Endowment and Publications, which was authorized by action of the Executive Council of the Association at its meeting in Nashville: Alfred J. Hanna, Rollins College, chairman; J. Winston Coleman, Jr., Lexington, Kentucky; Stanley F. Horn, Nashville, Tennessee; Walter B. Posey, Agnes Scott College; and Charles S. Sydnor, Duke University.

PERSONAL

Marshall W. Brown, professor of history at Presbyterian College, Clinton, South Carolina, has been made president of that institution, and entered upon the duties of his new office in February.

Otto A. Rothert, secretary of the Filson Club, Louisville, since 1917, and editor of the *Filson Club History Quarterly*, retired from active service on April 1.

Charles Evans, of Oklahoma City, has been appointed editor of the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* and secretary of the Oklahoma Historical Society.

At the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, Benjamin B. Kendrick continues to be on leave of absence because of illness, and the leave granted to Eugene E. Pfaff for service as director of the Southern Council on International Relations has been extended. Supply appointments in the history department include Richard Bardolph, a doctoral graduate of the University of Illinois, and Margaret M. Heflin, formerly a graduate student at the University of Chicago.

John C. Matthews, formerly professor of history at King College, and more recently at Stephens College, has been appointed professor of history and

chairman of the department of history and political science at Mercer University, Macon, Georgia, effective January 1, 1945.

John Tate Lanning, of Duke University, has retired from the editorship of the *Hispanic American Historical Review* to devote his full time to research and teaching. His successor in the editor's chair is James F. King, of the University of California.

Fletcher M. Green returned to his position at the University of North Carolina in March, after a year's leave of absence to serve as visiting professor of history at Harvard University.

Howard K. Beale of the University of North Carolina has been granted a one-year extension of his leave of absence to continue research for his biography of Theodore Roosevelt.

Raymond E. Lindgren of Occidental College, a doctoral graduate of the University of California at Los Angeles, has accepted an appointment as assistant professor of European history at Vanderbilt University, and will assume the duties of his new position at the beginning of the fall term in September.

Frederic Duncalf, professor of history at the University of Texas, has been made chairman of a committee composed of six members of the General Faculty and one each from the six colleges and schools of the University to advise with the Board of Regents on the selection of a permanent president.

Leaves of absence for service in various capacities in connection with the war effort have been granted to the following: Paul H. Clyde of Duke University, James W. Silver of the University of Mississippi, G. Holden Furber and Carlos E. Castañeda of the University of Texas, Alfred B. Thomas of the University of Alabama, and Grace Hennigan of the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina.

Hunter Dickinson Farish, director of the department of research of Colonial Williamsburg since 1937, died on January 16 at the age of forty-seven. A native of Alabama, he received his secondary education in the public schools of that state, and was graduated from Princeton University in 1922. He received the M. A. degree from Harvard University in 1926, and the Ph.D. degree in 1936. He served as assistant professor of history at Westminster College in Pennsylvania from 1926 to 1930, and as tutor and instructor at Harvard and at Radcliffe College in 1936-1937; and while associated with Colonial Williamsburg he was visiting professor at the College of William and Mary in 1939. His doctoral dissertation at Harvard was published under the title, *The Circuit Rider*

Dismounts: A Social History of Southern Methodism, 1865-1900 (1938). As director of research of Colonial Williamsburg he originated and was the general editor of the *Colonial Williamsburg Historical Studies*, and himself edited two of the volumes in that series; namely, the report of 1696, made by Hartwell, Blair, and Chilton, on *The Present State of Virginia and the College* (1940); and *The Journal and Letters of Philip Vickers Fithian, 1773-1774* (1943). He also assisted in working out the plans for the organization of the Institute of Early American History and Culture which is sponsored jointly by the College of William and Mary and Colonial Williamsburg, and served on the board of editors of the *William and Mary Quarterly*.

Frederic Bancroft, who has been active in historical research on an independent basis for more than half a century, died in Washington, D. C., on February 22 at the age of eighty-four. He was born in Illinois, was graduated from Amherst College in 1882, and received the Ph.D. degree at Columbia University in 1885. After further study in France and Germany, he served as librarian of the State Department from 1888 to 1892, and from time to time was lecturer in history at Amherst College, Columbia University, Johns Hopkins University, and the University of Chicago. Although he never held an official position in a college or university faculty, he made a material contribution to the political history of the United States, and especially to various aspects of southern history, through his writings and lectures, and through editorial work in national periodicals. His principal publications include: *The Negro in Politics* (1885); a two-volume *Life of William H. Seward* (1900); *The Political Career of Carl Schurz* (1908), done in collaboration with William A. Dunning; *Calhoun and the South Carolina Nullification Movement* (1928); and *Slave-Trading in the Old South* (1931). He also edited the six-volume edition of *Speeches, Correspondence, and Political Papers of Carl Schurz*, published in 1913 by the Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

The North Carolina State Literary and Historical Association held its forty-fourth annual meeting on December 7 in Raleigh. The program included a paper by Aubrey L. Brooks, of Greensboro, on "Walter Clark's Philosophy in Action," one by Henry M. Wagstaff, of the University of North Carolina, entitled, "A Footnote to Social History," and a review of North Carolina books and authors of the year, by Douglas L. Rights, of Winston-Salem. Hubert M. Poteat, of Wake Forest College, delivered his presidential address, entitled "White unto Harvest," and Senator James W. Fulbright of Arkansas spoke on "Prospects for Peace." At the annual business meeting the following officers were elected for the ensuing year: president, Aubrey L. Brooks, Greensboro; vice-presidents, Everett Gill, Wake Forest College, Cecil Johnson, University of

North Carolina, and Nannie M. Tilley, Duke University; secretary-treasurer, Christopher Crittenden, North Carolina Department of Archives and History.

At its annual business meeting, held in December, the East Tennessee Historical Society elected the following officers for the year 1945: president, Harvey Broome, Knoxville; vice-presidents, Helen M. Harris, Knoxville, Samuel C. Williams, Johnson City, and Culver H. Smith, University of Chattanooga; secretary, Martha L. Ellison, Lawson McGhee Library; treasurer, Laura E. Luttrell, Lawson McGhee Library; members of the executive committee, J. Wesley Hoffmann, University of Tennessee, and Nannie Lee Hicks, Fountain City. Stanley J. Folmsbee will continue to serve as editor of the Society's *Publications*.

Members of the Society are participating in the preparation of a history of Knox County, and the monthly programs for 1945 will consist largely of papers taken from chapters to be included in that volume. At the February meeting, T. M. N. Lewis, of the University of Tennessee, presented a paper on "Indian Life in the Knox County Area"; in March, Martha L. Ellison's paper dealt with "The History of the Public Library in Knoxville"; and in April, C. E. Allred, of the University of Tennessee, discussed "Agriculture in Knox County before the Civil War."

Recent programs of the Louisiana Historical Society's monthly meetings have included "The Louisiana Unification Movement of 1873," by T. Harry Williams (February), "Creole Civilization in Gentilly and St. James Parish," by Lionel C. Durel (March), and "The Notarial Archives of Orleans Parish," by Rudolph H. Waldo (April).

The annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, which was to have been held in Bloomington, Indiana, in April, was canceled in compliance with the government request to restrict conventions as a means of reducing unessential travel. The Executive Committee of the Association voted to continue the present officers for another year, and a meeting of that committee will probably be held later in the year.

The Tennessee Historical Commission has filled three vacancies in its membership by electing Mary U. Rothrock of Knoxville and Vernon Sharp, Jr., and Francis B. Warfield of Nashville to serve on that body. The report of the chairman of the Commission, Judge Samuel C. Williams, indicates that significant progress is being made in the preparation of some two score of county histories to be published in 1946 in connection with the program to commemorate the sesquicentennial of Tennessee's admission to statehood.

Research activity in the field of the South's participation in the present war has been increased by the establishment of the Virginia World War II History

Commission, which began its work in October, 1944, with headquarters in the University of Virginia Library. Lester J. Cappon, assistant professor of history and consultant in history and archives in that institution, is serving part-time as director of the agency, and W. Edwin Hemphill was granted leave of absence from Mary Washington College of the University of Virginia, Fredericksburg, to become assistant director. The Commission proposes to publish as soon as practicable a tentative list of Virginians who have died in the armed services and one or two preliminary booklets of a limited, topical nature. It hopes ultimately to issue several volumes constituting a comprehensive history of the state during the war period and a complete roster of all the state's servicemen and servicewomen, with brief biographical notes about each. An effort is being made to stimulate counties and cities to write and publish the war history of their respective localities. Other parts of the Commission's program call for the collection of original war records not available in printed form. The Virginia Conservation Commission's Division of History, which began to preserve and classify certain types of war records in October, 1942, is co-operating.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

Recent acquisitions of the Department of Archives of Louisiana State University include: the papers and family letters, 1849-1881, of John Durnin, St. Helena Parish, Louisiana; correspondence, 1827-1874, of Isaac F. Jackson, Amite County, Mississippi; the Lea-Sandifer collection, 1831-1910, including correspondence from members of the Lea family in the Confederate army, written from camps in Mississippi, and papers and notebooks of R. M. and H. W. Sandifer; the papers of D. L. McGehee, St. Helena Parish, 1858-1925, mostly miscellaneous family letters before and during the Civil War; a collection of letters, 1858-1863, written to William Allen, Pike County, Mississippi; the papers of George and Salena A. Nicholson, Holmesville, Mississippi, 1824-1897; the business papers of William and Walter Stewart, East Feliciana Parish, 1817-1933, together with six volumes of annual proceedings of the Masons of Louisiana, 1859-1869; papers of Robert A. and John O. Corbin of Hammond, Louisiana, 1835-1917, dealing especially with land transactions in Tangipahoa and Livingston parishes during the period following the close of the Civil War; letters and other papers of Micajah Wilkinson, Liberty, Mississippi, 1852-1935, including thirty-two volumes of the minutes of proceedings of the Mississippi Baptist Association, 1846, 1852-1860, and 1863-1886; a large collection of about ten thousand manuscripts and 175 manuscript volumes, giving a complete record of the business transactions by the Commercial Bank of Natchez and its branches in other communities, 1828-1876; miscellaneous letters and business papers of Edmund Herrin, St. Helena Parish, 1851-1891; additional papers of R. W. Patrick and J. E. Nash, Clinton, Louisiana, 1808-1918; papers of J. G. Kilbourne, Clinton, Louisiana, 1850-1864; letters to Mrs.

Elizabeth Carruth, St. Helena Parish, 1848-1871; family papers of the Walker-Knox-Alspaugh families, Clinton, Louisiana, 1851-1921; personal and business papers of Samuel Newsom, Tangipahoa, Louisiana, 1849-1917; papers of William Acy, Jr., Amite City, Louisiana, 1844-1908, dealing with property in Louisiana and Mississippi; miscellaneous Needham family papers, Tangipahoa Parish, Louisiana, 1850-1880; family correspondence and business papers of Dr. Jeptha McKinney, St. Helena Parish, 1841-1931; additions to the Lieutaud collection, New Orleans, 1770-1805, including miscellaneous records of the city government, orders of Cabildo, receipts, petitions, repairs and renting of city property, expense of city physicians, and papers of the Royal Hacienda; correspondence and other papers of the Hickey family of Louisiana, 1762-1846; and a large collection of material assembled by Felix H. Kuntz of New Orleans, which includes New Orleans city records of the Spanish and American regimes, 1770-1857, documents pertaining to Louisiana land records, 1770-1812, papers dealing with the West Florida Rebellion, 1810-1816, a collection of business papers of Manuel Lopez, 1802-1835, and a typescript copy of a two-volume Civil War diary by an unidentified diarist.

Manuscript accessions of the Maryland Historical Society during the past quarter include: the papers of Colonel Moses Rawlings, spanning the years 1774-1804, and dealing especially with his service as deputy commissary in charge of prisoners at Fort Frederick during the American Revolution; a group of "Letters taken in Prizes," 1778-1780, including letters on official, commercial, and personal matters; a collection of 204 papers of James McHenry, containing drafts of letters by him, letters to him, and miscellaneous memoranda; the papers of Captain Benjamin Jenne, describing trade with West Indian and Mediterranean ports, 1793-1804; some business papers of Nicholas Hickman for the period 1835-1857; and the original Civil War diary of Colonel Osman Latrobe.

Accessions of the North Carolina Department of Archives and History include thirteen transfiles of the correspondence of Governor J. Melville Broughton, 1941-1945, and eighteen manuscript boxes containing the report and supporting papers on conditions at the State Hospital in Morganton during the Broughton administration.

The Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, has acquired a valuable manuscript collection consisting of the correspondence, diaries, journals, and other papers of Noah M. Ludlow and Mathew C. Field, both of whom were prominent early theatrical figures in St. Louis, Mobile, and New Orleans. Prompt books, playbills, and 165 pieces of early music used in the theater round out the collection and reveal many interesting sidelights on the early theater in the South and the West.

The Manuscripts Division of the Duke University Library has recently received a collection of manuscripts which includes approximately three hundred biographical sketches of North Carolinians prominent in all phases of the state's history. These sketches seem to have been written for a proposed supplementary volume of Samuel A. Ashe and others (editors), *Biographical History of North Carolina* (8 vols., Greensboro, 1905-1907), which was never published.

Among the recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress, the following, arranged in chronological order of material, have a bearing upon southern history: reproduction of manuscripts in Spanish archives of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Archivo General de Indias, Seville, and Archivo Histórico Nacional, Madrid), 2093 pages; papers of Jonathan Roberts, a free Negro, his descendants, and others, 1734-1944; photostats of letters from George Washington, 1775, 1792, 1797, 1798; microfilm reproductions of papers of Thomas Jefferson, mainly letters from Jefferson to Albert Gallatin (New York Historical Society), 1779-1826; four additional boxes of the papers of James McHenry, 1790-1810; photostats of the constitutions of Tennessee, February 6, 1796, August 30, 1834, February 23, 1870; additional papers, mainly correspondence, of Commodore John Rodgers and his family, 1800-1844; 160 papers of McNair and Company (also variant names) relating to stagecoach routes in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Kentucky, 1802-1842; two account books of Andrew Johnson, 1829-1860; letter from John Tyler to Dr. William H. Gardiner, May 21, 1852; letter from Thomas Hart Benton to Martin Van Buren, undated; photostats of four letters from Thaddeus Stevens to Colonel L. Blanchard, 1855-1862; one box of the papers of Major James J. Gillette, 1857-1887; letter from Abraham Lincoln to George B. McClellan, April 9, 1862; letter press copies, Office of Engineers, on Defense of Washington, South of the Potomac, May 9, 1862, to June 8, 1865, 1 volume; reproduction of letter from Nathan Bedford Forrest to Garnett Andrews, November 5, 1867; additional papers of the Breckinridge family, mainly letters from Robert J. Breckinridge to Sophonisba P. Breckinridge, 1915, 1935-1944.

The return to the Division and shelving of the manuscript material which had been evacuated for safety was completed early this year.

Records relating to military affairs continue to predominate among National Archives accessions. Material received recently from the Navy Department includes Naval Intelligence records, among which are reports on subversive activities during World War I, files of *The Japan Advertiser*, and reports and other records of naval attachés at various diplomatic posts, 1917-1933; records of the Philadelphia Navy Yard, 1827-1926, and the New York Navy Yard, 1842-1922; and records relating to the operation of the Federal Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company at Kearny, New Jersey, by the Navy Department, 1941-

1942. The War Department material received consists largely of field records and includes correspondence, maps, and other records of district engineers at Providence, 1800-1921, Albany, 1820-1940, New York City, 1864-1934, Pittsburgh, 1890-1940, and Philadelphia, 1893-1936; and records of Army commands, such as Fort Adams and headquarters of the Coast Defenses of Narragansett Bay, 1865-1917, Forts Banks, Andrews, Strong, and Warren, 1866-1915, and Fort Huachuca and headquarters of the 25th Infantry, 1867-1929.

Materials acquired recently by the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park, New York, include manuscripts, photographs, and prints relating to United States naval history; pamphlets and broadsides used in recent presidential campaigns; and sound recordings, motion pictures, photographs, and books on subjects connected with the present war. From the President was received a gift of some 300 letters and 22 journals and notebooks of Commodore David Conner (1792-1856), commander of the Gulf Squadron during the War with Mexico. The papers cover the years 1812-1855 and touch upon every important period of Conner's life, from his service aboard the *Hornet* in the War of 1812 to his operations against the Mexican ports in the summer and fall of 1846. Some of the letters and most of the journals relate to his family and professional life in Philadelphia, where he was assigned to the Navy Yard, and in Washington, as an official of the Navy Department. They contain much material on the social history of the period. Other naval history items received include a number of prints, engravings, and photographs of United States war vessels from the period of the Civil War to the present.

From Miss Mary W. Dewson, formerly director of the Women's Division of the Democratic National Committee, were received correspondence, pamphlets, broadsides, copies of speeches, and programs of meetings, conferences, and dinners relating to the activities of the Women's Division in the presidential campaigns of 1936, 1940, and 1944.

The University of Florida announces the establishment of the Philip K. Yonge Library of Florida History, which has as its foundation the collection of Floridiana brought together during the past forty years by Philip Keyes Yonge and his son, Julien C. Yonge. This collection, comprising rare books, maps, manuscripts, newspaper files of the last century, documents, and other records, all relating to Florida, has been presented to the University by Julien C. Yonge as a memorial to his father, a former chairman of the Board of Control of the Institutions of Higher Learning of Florida.

The National Archives and the Maryland Hall of Records are co-operating in the presentation of a short training course on the preservation and administration of archives for custodians of institutional and business archives, to be offered by the American University in Washington, D. C., from June 11 to

June 30. This course is designed to familiarize such custodians with the basic theories and processes of archival work. It will consist of supervised reading, laboratory work, and classroom instruction in the form of seventeen lectures on such topics as the evaluation and accessioning of archival material, repair and preservation, arrangement and description, reproduction and publication, and reference service. Special emphasis will be given to the problems of small institutions. On three days a week instruction and laboratory work will take place at the Maryland Hall of Records in Annapolis and on the other three days at the National Archives. The course will be conducted by Ernst Posner, adjunct professor of archives administration of the American University, Morris L. Radoff, archivist of the Maryland Hall of Records, and members of the staffs of the Maryland Hall of Records and the National Archives.

Doctoral Dissertations Accepted by American Universities, 1943-1944 (New York, H. W. Wilson Company, 1944), edited by Edward A. Henry, lists the following subjects in the field of southern history: "The Anglican Church and the American Revolution," by Richard J. Hooker (University of Chicago); "The War Governors in the American Revolution," by Margaret B. Macmillan (Columbia University); "James Iredell," by Nettie S. Herndon (Duke University); "The Intellectual Origins of Jeffersonian Democracy," by Douglass G. Adair (Yale University); "The Early Career of William Pinkney, Diplomat and Constitutional Lawyer," by Max P. Allen (Indiana University); "The Public Career of Hugh Lawson White," by L. Paul Gresham (Vanderbilt University); "The Pioneer Lawyer and Jurist in Missouri," by William F. English (University of Missouri); "Agricultural Reform in the Georgia Piedmont, 1820-1860," by James C. Bonner (University of North Carolina); "Nativism in Kentucky to 1860," by Sister Agnes Geraldine McGann (Catholic University); "American Negro Slave Revolts," by Herbert Aptheker (Columbia University); "American Catholic Opinion in the Slavery Controversy," by Madeleine H. Rice. (Columbia University); "The Slavery Issue as a Factor in Massachusetts Politics, 1850-1861," by Godfrey T. Anderson (University of Chicago); "The Attitude of the New York Press toward Lincoln and the Slavery Question," by Mildred E. Hogen (Marquette University); "Political Readjustment in Tennessee, 1869-1870," by James G. Tallant (George Peabody College for Teachers); "New Orleans as a Wholesale Trading Center," by Harry A. Mitchell (University of Michigan); "William Peterfield Trent: A Critical Biography," by Franklin T. Walker (George Peabody College for Teachers).

In the Appendix of the *Congressional Record* for November 30, 1944 (pp. 4915-18), there appears the text of an address, entitled "Thomas Burke, Revolutionary War Governor and Champion of State Rights," which was delivered by Archibald Henderson of the University of North Carolina on the occasion of the dedication of a monolith at the tomb of Governor Burke near

Hillsboro, North Carolina, on October 15. The part played by Burke in proposing the "state rights principle" in the Continental Congress and in securing its incorporation in the Articles of Confederation is given special emphasis.

Thomas Jefferson's Garden Book, 1766-1824, with Relevant Extracts from His Other Writings (Philadelphia, American Philosophical Society, 1944, pp. 704, \$5.00), annotated by Edwin Morris Betts, is Volume XXII of the *Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society*. In it the garden diary itself merely serves as the basis for bringing together an imposing collection of notes, letters, extracts from memorandum books, and other pertinent material from Jefferson's papers which have a bearing upon his botanical and agricultural concerns. The material is chronologically arranged, and the thoroughness of the annotation gives proof of an immense amount of detailed research. Not only does it contribute toward a better understanding of Jefferson himself, but, to quote one reviewer, "It is more diverting and instructive for the sons and daughters of Cain than any seed catalogue in February" (See *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, LIII, 141).

Georgetown Houses of the Federal Period: Washington, D. C., 1780-1830 (New York, Architectural Book Publishing Company, 1944, pp. 130, \$5.00), by Deering Davis, Stephen P. Dorsey, and Ralph C. Hall, is primarily concerned with the interest of the American Institute of Decorators in adapting the survivals from the early period to modern living; but it also presents valuable historical information on the architecture and architects of the period. Not the least striking feature is the revelation that at least twenty-five per cent of the structures erected in Georgetown before 1825 are still in use.

Firearms of the Confederacy: The Shoulder Arms, Pistols, and Revolvers of the Confederate Soldier (Huntington, W. Va., Standard Publications, Inc., 1944, pp. 333, \$12.50), by Claude E. Fuller and Richard D. Steuart, has grown out of the desire of the authors, both of whom are collectors of small arms, to establish the origin and to classify and describe the models in their possession. By means of photographs and concise summaries they show practically the entire arsenal of the Confederacy, and their book will be an essential tool for any student who may seek to present an inclusive history of Confederate armament.

Belle Boyd, Confederate Spy (Richmond, Dietz Press, 1944, pp. 254, \$3.00), by Louis A. Sigaud, is the product of an effort to cut through the maze of mystery and conflicting opinion concerning a woman whose very existence has at times come dangerously near to becoming obscured in legend. On the basis of careful study of documentary evidence, Colonel Sigaud has put together an account of her character and activities which not only removes all possibility

of doubt as to her existence, but also depicts her as possessed of a keen intellect and an enthusiasm for her cause which made her the most feared of all Confederate agents operating within the Federal lines. Those who question the propriety of her conduct will no doubt continue to be skeptical of both her character and her loyalty; but the documented proof presented here should go far toward giving her a place in history as one of the most famous of women spies.

Rivers of the Eastern Shore: Seventeen Maryland Rivers (New York, Farrar and Rinehart, 1944, pp. viii, 359, \$2.50), by Hulbert Footner, the latest volume in the *Rivers of America* series, portrays the rise, scope, and importance of the regional culture which developed in the more or less isolated area lying between Chesapeake Bay and the Atlantic Ocean. Despite much tedious detail, the book offers an entertaining view of a highly particularistic group of communities which are revealed by the author to have championed human rights, prevented the British from taking Baltimore in 1814, and sympathized with the Confederacy in 1861-1865.

Guide to the Manuscripts of the Wisconsin Historical Society (Madison, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1944, pp. xiv, 290), edited by Alice E. Smith, presents a list in alphabetical order of all classes of manuscripts owned by the Society, together with brief analyses of the contents of the more extensive collections. The Draper Papers, having been described in an earlier list which is still in print, have been omitted; and the recently acquired collection of the Richard T. Ely Papers was received too late to be included. Because of the importance of the manuscript collection which it describes, as well as because of the scholarly workmanship which went into its preparation, this *Guide* at once becomes an invaluable aid for research workers in all parts of the country.

The United States, 1865-1900: A Survey of Current Literature, with Abstracts of Unpublished Dissertations, Volume II (Fremont, Ohio, The Rutherford B. Hayes-Lucy Webb Hayes Foundation, 1944, pp. vii, 453), edited by Curtis W. Garrison with the assistance of an Editorial Board, continues the survey begun in the first volume of this bibliographical guide by covering the literature which appeared during the period from September, 1942, to December, 1943. In the extent of coverage and the plan of arrangement this volume represents an improvement over its predecessor, but the editor himself expresses his regret that "There is a little too much ordinary summary in this work for it to be the helpful project it was intended." On the basis of experience in the preparation of the first two volumes it should be possible to make the next one a clearer appraisal of the contribution to knowledge which has been made by the year's output. Even without that, however, the project has proved itself immensely valuable as an aid to those whose interest lies in that period of American history immediately following the Civil War.

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

- "The Use of Rockets by the British in the War of 1812," by Ralph Robinson, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (March).
- "Vignettes of Maryland History," continued, by Raphael Semmes, *ibid.*
- "Fort St. Inigoes," by Fanny C. Gough, *ibid.*
- "Diary of Reuben Dorsey of Howard County," by Robert S. Smith, *ibid.*
- "Dr. Thomas Bray's Trip to Maryland: A Study in Militant Anglican Humanitarianism," by Samuel Clyde McCulloch, in the *William and Mary Quarterly* (January).
- "The Colonial Churches of Essex and Richmond Counties," by George Carrington Mason, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (January).
- "Some XVII Century Virginians: Commentaries upon the Ancestry of Benjamin Harrison," continued, by Francis Burton Harrison, *ibid.*
- "Men of Eminence in Staunton and Augusta County," by Duncan Curry, *ibid.*
- "Additional Data on the Importation of Convicts," by Matthew Page Andrews, *ibid.*
- "More About 'Jayle Birds' in Colonial Virginia," by Polly Cary Mason, *ibid.*
- "The Army of Northern Virginia," by Robert H. Woody, in the *South Atlantic Quarterly* (January).
- "Jacob Dolson Cox in West Virginia," by Clarice Lorene Bailes, in *West Virginia History* (October).
- "Some West Virginia Scholars," by Carroll H. Quenzel, *ibid.*
- "The Press in the Making of West Virginia," by John Lewis Kiplinger, *ibid.* (January).
- "Two Famous Springs of Eastern West Virginia," by Thomas Marshall Hunter, *ibid.*
- "Eighteenth Century New Bern: A History of the Town and Craven County, 1700-1800; Part I, Colonization of the Neuse," by Alonzo Thomas Dill, Jr., in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (January).
- "Pembroke State College for Indians: Historical Sketch," by Clifton Oxendine, *ibid.*
- "North Carolinians in Mississippi History," by James Wesley Silver, *ibid.*
- "Naming Carolina," by William Patterson Cumming, *ibid.*
- "The Domestic Life of William Gaston, Catholic Jurist," by J. Herman Schauinger, in the *Catholic Historical Review* (January).
- "Nashville during the Civil War," by Stanley F. Horn, in the *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* (March).
- "The Federal Food Administration of Tennessee and Its Records in the National Archives, 1917-1919," by Harry L. Coles, Jr., *ibid.*
- "Some Aspects of the 1844 Presidential Campaign in Tennessee," by Clara Bracken Washburn, *ibid.*

- "Lincoln in Kentucky as Recorded by the Lincoln Herald," by R. Gerald McMurtry, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (January).
- "Milksickness in Kentucky and the Western Country," by Philip D. Jordan, *ibid.*
- "Dr. Preston W. Brown, 1775-1826: His Family and Descendants," by Bayless E. Hardin, *ibid.*
- "The Family and Fortune of General James Ray, Pioneer of Fort Harrod," by Kathryn Harrod Mason, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (January).
- "The Farmers' Alliance in Missouri," by Homer Clevenger, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (October).
- "The Anti-Masonic Movement in Early Missouri," by Arthur Lloyd Collins, *ibid.*
- "Missourians in the Gold Rush," by Kate L. Gregg, *ibid.* (January).
- "The Background of Reform on the Missouri Frontier," by Marie George Windell, *ibid.*
- "Free Land Hunters of the Southern Plains," by Carl Coke Rister, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (Winter).
- "Story of the Oklahoma Boundaries," by M. E. Melvin, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

- "Civilian Defense in Baltimore, 1814-1815," continued, edited by William D. Hoyt, Jr., in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (March).
- "Letters from Nicholas Harwood, M. D., U. S. N., Prisoner of War in Tripoli, 1803-1805," edited by Edith Rossiter Bevan, *ibid.*
- "William Byrd's Defense of Sir Edmund Andros," edited by Louis B. Wright, in the *William and Mary Quarterly* (January).
- "The Missing Pages of William Byrd's Secret History of the Line," edited by Maude H. Woodfin, *ibid.*
- "Matthew Fontaine Maury: A Letter from His Daughter Mrs. Corbin," contributed by Elie Maury Fitzgerald, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (January).
- "West Virginians in the American Revolution," continued, edited by Ross B. Johnston, in *West Virginia History* (October and January).
- "The Ledger of the McClure Trading Post, Wheeling on the Ohio in Virginia," edited by O. D. Lambert, *ibid.* (January).
- "The Life of Alfred Mordecai as Related by Himself," edited by James A. Padgett, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (January).
- "Some Tennessee Letters during the Polk Administration," continued, edited by Joseph H. Parks, in the *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* (March).
- "A Bibliography of the Lower Blue Licks (with Annotations)," continued,

compiled by Willard Rouse Jillson, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (January).

- "Westward along the Boone's Lick Trail in 1826: The Diary of Colonel John Glover," edited by Marie George Windell, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (January).
- "Reminiscences of Pioneer Days in the Cherokee Strip," by G. E. Lemon, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (Winter).

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "Georgia and the Texas Revolution," by Claude Elliott, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (December).
- "Zephaniah Kingsley, Nonconformist, (1765-1843)," by Philip S. May, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (January).
- "The Flags of the State of Florida," by Dorothy Dodd, *ibid.*
- "Luciano de Herrera, Spanish Spy in British St. Augustine," by Katherine S. Lawson, *ibid.*
- "Pioneer Florida: The First Railroads," by T. Frederick Davis, *ibid.*
- "History and Archaeology in Florida," by John W. Griffin, *ibid.*
- "Negroes and the East Florida Annexation Plot, 1811-1813," by Kenneth Wiggins Porter, in the *Journal of Negro History* (January).
- "Louisiana's Administration of Swamp Land Funds," by Sam Mims, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (January).
- "The Origin and Early Settlement of Baton Rouge, Louisiana," by Andrew C. Albrecht, *ibid.*
- "A History of the English Theatre at New Orleans, 1806-1842," by Nelle Smither, *ibid.*
- "The Pointe Coupee Cut-off in Historical Writings," by Hilgard O'Reilly Sternberg, *ibid.*
- "The Little Obelisk in the Cathedral Square in New Orleans," by Andre LaFargue, *ibid.*
- "The Unsolved Murder of Ben Thompson: Pistoleer Extraordinary," by Paul Adams, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (January).
- "The Sage of Cedar Bayou [John Peter Sjolander]," by T. C. Richardson, *ibid.*
- "Perote Fort—Where Texans Were Imprisoned," by J. J. McGrath and Wallace Hawkins, *ibid.*
- "The Farmers' Alliance in Texas, 1875-1900," by Ralph Smith, *ibid.*
- "Stephen F. Austin and Education in Early Texas, 1821-1835," by Max Berger, *ibid.*
- "The Production of Tobacco in Texas," by George T. McNess, *ibid.*
- "Hurrah for Dallas," by Herbert Gambrell, in the *Southwest Review* (Spring).
- "Heinrich Vonfie, Texas Freighter," by Patricia Salzman, in the *American-German Review* (December).

"The Effect of the Spanish Reoccupation of Eastern Texas upon French Policy in Louisiana, 1715-1717," by Charmion Shelby, in the *Hispanic American Historical Review* (November).

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

"Charleston in the Summer of 1841: The Letters of Harriett Horry Rutledge," by Harriet R. Holman, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (January).

"A Provisional Guide to Manuscripts in the South Carolina Historical Society," continued, by Helen G. McCormack, *ibid.*

"Minutes of the Vestry of St. Stephen's Parish, South Carolina, 1754-1873," continued, edited by Anne Allston Porcher, *ibid.*

"Marriage and Death Notices from the City Gazette of Charleston, South Carolina," continued, contributed by Elizabeth H. Jersey, *ibid.*

"Journal of General Peter Horry," continued, *ibid.*

"Memoirs of Frederick Adolphus Porcher," continued, edited by Samuel Gillard Stoney, *ibid.*

"Church-Going at Midway, Georgia, as Remembered by Matilda Harden Stevens," edited by Annie Sabra Ramsey, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (December).

"A Civil War Letter on the Capture of Atlanta," edited by Medora Field Perkerson, *ibid.*

"Narrative of the Hostilities Committed by the Natchez against the Concession of St. Catherine, October 21, November 4, 1722," translated and edited by Dawson Phelps, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (January).

"The Plantation Record Book of Brookdale Farm, Amite County, 1856-1857," edited by Lucille Griffith, *ibid.*

"Check List of Texas Imprints, 1846-1876," continued, edited by E. W. Winkler, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (January).

GENERAL AND REGIONAL ARTICLES, DOCUMENTS, AND COMPILATIONS

"Projects in American History and Culture," in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (March).

"Marquette's Autograph Map of the Mississippi River," by Jean Delanglez, in *Mid-America* (January).

"Jonathan Boucher: Champion of the Minority," by Robert G. Walker, in the *William and Mary Quarterly* (January).

"The Colonization of the Bahamas, 1647-1670," by W. Hubert Miller, *ibid.*

"Unpublished Mazzei Letters to Jefferson," concluded, edited by Howard R. Marraro, *ibid.*

"Christopher Gist and the Trans-Allegheny Frontier: A Phase of the West-

- ward Movement," by Kenneth P. Bailey, in the *Pacific Historical Review* (March).
- "John Taylor: Economist of Southern Agrarianism," by William D. Grampp, in the *Southern Economic Journal* (January).
- "Southern Chivalry and Total War," by R. M. Weaver, in the *Sewanee Review* (Spring).
- "Francis Lieber, Pennsylvania German Dialect," edited by Felix Reichmann, in the *American-German Review* (February).
- "The Negro on the Mining Frontier," by W. Sherman Savage, in the *Journal of Negro History* (January).
- "The Negro's Struggle for Freedom in Its Birthplace," by Charles H. Wesley, *ibid.*
- "The Negro's Struggle for Participation in Primary Elections," by Louise Overacker, *ibid.*
- "The Slave Preacher—Portrait of a Leader," by Nancy Bullock Woolridge, in the *Journal of Negro Education* (Winter).
- "The Plain Truth about the Bixby Letter," by David Rankin Barbee, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (January).
- "Getting the Most out of Local History," by Edward P. Alexander, in *Michigan History* (January).
- "John Sharp Williams and the University of Virginia," by George C. Osborn, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (January).

CONTRIBUTORS

FRANK L. OWSLEY is professor of history at Vanderbilt University.

GEORGE WINSTON SMITH is associate professor of history at American University, Washington, D. C.

KATHRYN ABBEY HANNA is lecturer on Latin American history at Rollins College, Winter Park, Florida.

ARTHUR S. LINK is a Rosenwald research fellow in history in the Graduate School at Columbia University.

DUVON C. CORBITT is professor of history at Columbia College, Columbia, South Carolina.

JOHN TATE LANNING is professor of history at Duke University.

THE HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

A quarterly circulated widely in Latin America and the United States containing articles, inedited documents, book reviews, minor notices, and professional news.

MANAGING EDITOR: JOHN TATE LANNING
ASSOCIATE MANAGING EDITOR: ALAN K. MANCHESTER

BOARD OF EDITORS

ARTHUR S. AITON	IRVING A. LEONARD
CARLOS E. CASTANEDA	ALAN K. MANCHESTER
ROSCOE R. HILL	DANA G. MUNRO
ROLAND DENNIS HUSSEY	CHARLES E. NOWELL
JOHN TATE LANNING	ARTHUR P. WHITAKER

ADVISORY EDITORS

HERBERT E. BOLTON	CLARENCE H. HARING
ISAAC JOSLIN COX	J. FRED RIPPY
WILLIAM SPENCE ROBERTSON	

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$4.00 A YEAR
SPECIAL RATES TO GRADUATE STUDENTS

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Durham, North Carolina

VIRGINIA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Organized 1831 — Chartered 1834

ALEXANDER W. WEDDELL, PRESIDENT

Publishers of the

VIRGINIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

The April, 1945, issue contains the following:

Comments on Virginia's Contribution to American Civilization, by Thomas Perkins Abernethy

Self-Portrait: Eliza Custis, 1808, by William D. Hoyt, Jr.

A Frenchman Visits Norfolk, Fredericksburg, and Orange County, 1816, by L. G. Moffat and J. M. Carriere.

John Washington Settles in Virginia, by Beverley Fleet

A Frenchman's Note on Certain Lands in Virginia, by David Lee Clark.

Book Reviews

Genealogies

Notes

MEMBERSHIPS: Life, \$100.00; Annual Sustaining, \$50.00;

Annual Supporting, \$25.00; Annual, \$5.00

Magazine sent without additional charge to members

The Lee House, 707 East Franklin St.
RICHMOND 19, VIRGINIA

Editor and Corresponding Sec'y.
CLAYTON TORRENCE

The Pacific Historical Review

*Issued by the
Pacific Coast Branch
of the*

American Historical Association

Articles, documents, book reviews, comments
and historical news on the entire Pacific area

BOARD OF EDITORS

Managing Editor: LOUIS KNOTT KOONTZ

Book Review Editor: JOHN W. CAUGHEY

DAN E. CLARK

FRANCIS H. HERRICK

PETER M. DUNNE, S.J.

MERRILL M. JENSEN

WILLIAM H. ELLISON

W. KAYE LAMB

MAX SAVELLE

Published in March, June, September, and December

Subscription rates: \$4.00 a year;
Canada, \$4.25; other countries, \$4.50

SPECIAL RATES TO STUDENTS

A sample copy will be sent on request

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

The William and Mary Quarterly

A Magazine of Early American History, Institutions, and Culture

A new series of the William and Mary College Quarterly
with a broadened field of interest

Published by the College of William and Mary

Board of Editors

THOMAS P. ABERNETHY
University of Virginia

RICHARD L. MORTON
College of William and Mary

RANDOLPH G. ADAMS
Clements Library

CURTIS P. NETTELS
Cornell University

JULIAN P. BOYD
Princeton University

STANLEY PARCELLIS
Newberry Library

VIRGINIUS DABNEY
Richmond *Times-Dispatch*

JOHN E. POMFRET
College of William and Mary

DOUGLAS SOUTHALL FREEMAN
Richmond *News Leader*

ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER
Harvard University

LEONARD W. LABAREE
Yale University

EARL G. SWEM
College of William and Mary

SAMUEL ELIOT MORISON
Harvard University

THOMAS J. WERTENBAKER
Princeton University

LOUIS B. WRIGHT, Huntington Library

Managing Editor RICHARD L. MORTON, College of William and Mary

Subscription rates: \$4.00 the calendar year. \$1.00 a copy

Correspondence relating to the

William and Mary Quarterly should be addressed to the Managing Editor,
College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia



THE TEXAS STATE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

1897—*The Oldest Learned Society in Texas*—1897

Offers in THE SOUTHWESTERN HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

Articles, documents, comments, news notes, and book reviews
dealing with Texas and the Southwest

Managing Editor

WALTER PRESCOTT WEBB

Associate Editors

CHARLES W. HACKETT RUDOLPH L. BIESELE
H. BAILEY CARROLL

Subscription rate: \$3.00 per year

Correspondence relating to contributions and subscriptions should be
addressed to the Managing Editor, University Station, Austin, Texas.

The Association also publishes

THE JUNIOR HISTORIAN

A literary and historical magazine by and for young people of
Junior High, Senior High, and Lower College levels. The first
magazine in America for young people also written almost
exclusively by them.

Editor

H. BAILEY CARROLL

Subscription rate: \$1.00 per school year.

Correspondence relating to *The Junior Historian* should be
addressed to the Editor, University Station, Austin, Texas.

AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

Designed as a medium for the publication of research and documents pertaining to the history of agriculture in all its phases and as a clearing house for information of interest and value to workers in the field. Materials on the history of agriculture in all countries are included and also material on institutions, organizations, and sciences which have been factors in agricultural development.

ISSUED QUARTERLY SINCE 1927

BY

THE AGRICULTURAL HISTORY SOCIETY

Subscriptions, including membership: Regular, \$3.00; Student, \$1.50;
Contributing, \$10.00; Life, a sum in dollars equal to 100 less
age of applicant.

Editor:

EVERETT E. EDWARDS

Secretary-Treasurer:

ARTHUR G. PETERSON

ROOM 3901, SOUTH BUILDING, 13TH AND C STREETS SW
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Complete back files of

THE JOURNAL OF SOUTHERN HISTORY

Including title page and index for each volume
may be obtained at \$3.00 per volume

Single numbers can be supplied at 75 cents each

SEND ORDERS TO

JAMES W. PATTON, *Secretary-Treasurer*

NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA

THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

•

PRESIDENT

FLETCHER M. GREEN, University of North Carolina

VICE-PRESIDENT

ELLA LONN, Goucher College

SECRETARY-TREASURER

JAMES W. PATTON, North Carolina State College

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(In addition to the officers named above)

EX-PRESIDENTS

(For three years following expiration of their terms)

ALBERT B. MOORE, University of Alabama (1945)

J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON, University of North Carolina (1946)

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University (1947)

MANAGING EDITOR

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY, Vanderbilt University

ELECTED MEMBERS

WILLIAM G. BEAN, Washington and Lee University (1945)

JENNINGS B. SANDERS, Memphis State College (1945)

LYNN M. CASE, Louisiana State University (1946)

RALPH B. FLANDERS, New York University (1946)

J. WINSTON COLEMAN, JR., Lexington, Kentucky (1947)

HENRY T. SHANKS, Birmingham-Southern College (1947)